Monday, April 27, 1953

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

HOUSE OF THE PEOPLE

OFFICIAL REPORT

PARLIAMENT SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI

Price Six Annas (Inland)
Price Two Shillings (Foreign)

Gazettes & Debates Section
Parliament Library Building
Room No. FB-025
Block 'G'
Acc. No. 25158
Dated 21.11.2014

THE
PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES
(Part I—Questions and Answers)
OFFICIAL REPORT

HOUSE OF THE PEOPLE

Monday, 27th April, 1953.

The House met at a Quarter Past Eight of the Clock.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS.

EXPORT OF CLOTH

***1614. Dr. Ram Subhag Singh:** Will the Minister of **Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state whether the exports of all varieties of cloth will be allowed to be licensed freely even after the end of June, 1953, the period fixed at present?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): Exports of cloth are being allowed freely upto the end of September, 1953.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: May I know whether the value of our cloth exports has shown any noticeable increase since the adoption of this free licensing system?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I should say, 'yes', Sir. I have not got the values here but I have got the figures in yardage. The export restrictions were relaxed in the middle of May, I think it was on the 17th. Previous to that, in the first four months of 1952, the average was somewhere about 25 million yards. In May, it shot up to 46 million, in June, 69 million, July 69 million, August 82 million yards and then it started coming down, 65 million yards in September, 63 mililon in October, 50 million in November and 40 million in December. It was in January that we decided to lower the export duties and since then the average of about 45 to 46 million yards has been maintained.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: May I know, Sir, the effect of this system as also the lowering of the cloth export duty on our internal market—I mean the consumers who use coarse and medium varieties of cloth—as well as the manufacture of these varieties of cloth?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I don't think there have been any adverse effects at all. On the other hand, I think, today the stock of the varieties mentioned by the hon. Member are in plenty. As a matter of precaution, we are still maintaining price control in regard to those types of cloth which go into the export trade and I do not think it is possible for the situation to get out of hand in any manner.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: Has the prices of these varieties of cloth shown any increment?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Well, markets are fluctuating, Sir, according to various circumstances. I won't say, so far as the consumer is concerned, at the retail end, there has been any appreciable increase. On the other hand, I am told there has been a substantial decrease.

Shri Kelappan: Do the figures given include the export of handloom cloth also?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: So far as export figures are concerned, they are group figures. But, we can give the export of handloom cloth separately.

Shri Kelappan: May I know whether there has been any appreciable increase in the export of handloom cloth?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I should like to have notice.

PROPAGANDA BY INDIAN JUTE MILLS ASSOCIATION

***1615. Shri B. K. Das:** Will the Minister of **Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state:

(a) what propaganda is carried on by the Indian Jute Mills Association for popularising jute goods in U.S.A.;

(b) whether similar propaganda is done in some other countries also; and

(c) whether any improvement in demands has been perceptible as a result of expanding the propaganda work?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): (a) A public relations and promotional campaign was initiated by the Indian Jute Mills Association in the United States in August 1952, the object being to promote the sale of burlap and to regain the markets lost to substitutes and bulk-handling. The campaign, it is understood, is being conducted mainly through trade advertisements and radio and television programmes directed to the farming community.

(b) The Association is reported to be considering the desirability of undertaking similar propaganda in the United Kingdom. A delegation of theirs is at present visiting Australia and New Zealand on a similar propaganda mission.

(c) An attempt to appraise the effects of this campaign at present would be premature.

Shri B. K. Das: May I know, Sir, what will be the total expenditure of the Indian Jute Mills Association for this propaganda?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: The last year's budget was in the region of $ 100,000; in the next year, I have increased it by another $ 10,000.

Shri B. K. Das: What was the special need for making a grant of $ 25,000 to this Association for this propaganda in U.S.A.?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: In order to encourage them to spend more money on propaganda, which will ultimately benefit the economy of this country and the exchequer of this country also.

Shri B. K. Das: Was this grant asked for or was it given by Government of their own accord?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: These things are very difficult to say. The cause and effect of this particular transaction was like this. It might have been indicated that they would like to have some kind of government support and the Government were generous enough to offer that support.

Shri B. K. Das: Is there any condition attached to this grant or will they be free to make any kind of propaganda they choose?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I am afraid, Sir, there is no question of their making any kind of propaganda. The outline of the propaganda is laid down and Government are aware of it; but the grant is unconditional.

Shri T. K. Chaudhuri: May I know whether our customers in U.S.A. are changing over to producers in other countries, and, if so, what steps are being taken to check that?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Sir, the campaign is more in the region of persuading people to switch back to the use of burlap and from that point of view it has been a success, because the figures for 1951 and 1952 show a record increase of somewhere between 60 and 70 per cent. in the consumption of burlap. But, so far as switching over to other countries is concerned, it is a matter of price and we have essentially got to meet other countries so far as price is concerned.

Shri T. K. Chaudhuri: May I know what is the state of the market in regard to sacking?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I should like to have notice, Sir.

Shri S. C. Samanta: May I know, whether over and above this propaganda, the Indian Central Jute Committee is contemplating to set up a Jute Expansion Board on the lines of the Tea Expansion Board?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: As far as I am aware, Sir, I don't think there is any such move in contemplation.

MANUFACTURE OF METALS

***1617. Dr. Ram Subhag Singh:** Will the Minister of **Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state the total values of metals manufactured in India during the years 1951-52 and 1952-53?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): A statement is laid on the Table of the House. [*See* Appendix X, annexure No. 21.]

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: May I know, Sir, whether the raw materials of the metals which have been mentioned in this statement are also exported to other foreign countries for manufacturing purposes?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Sir, I am afraid I cannot answer a very general question of this nature. If the hon. Member would put down a specific question I might be able to answer. In this statement we have given 5 commodities and I am not sure which commodity he has in mind with regard to export of raw materials.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: What are the metals whose manufacturing plants do not exist in this country at all?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I do not know exactly what he means by 'manufacturing', whether it is processing or manufacturing out of metals.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: Processing.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Of course, we are not in a position to process lead here.

IRRIGATION DEVELOPMENT (WAYS AND MEANS) FUND

***1618. Shri L. N. Mishra:** (a) Will the Minister of **Planning** be pleased to state the steps taken so far for the creation of Irrigation Development (Ways and Means) Fund in pursuance of the suggestions made by the Planning Commission?

(b) Is such fund to be purely a concern of the State Government or of both the State and the Union Governments?

The Deputy Minister of Irrigation and Power (Shri Hathi): (a) The proposal to create an Irrigation Development (Ways and Means) Fund was accepted by the Government of Bombay, Madras, Bihar, Punjab, Madhya-Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh, West Bengal, Hyderabad, Mysore and Travancore-Cochin. Madhya Pradesh established a non-lapseable fund in 1952-53 with a small contribution of Rs. 10 lakhs a year. No other State has yet established such a Fund.

(b) According to the proposal made by the Planning Commission, the Irrigation Development (Ways and Means) Fund was intended to include contributions from the general revenues, proceeds of betterment fees and receipts of loans raised by the States, as well as such assistance from the Central Government in the form of loans and grants as might be feasible.

Shri L. N. Mishra: May I know whether the funds collected under this Act would be spent only for productive irrigation purposes or whether they will be spent for unproductive irrigation works also?

Shri Hathi: These are questions of detail. They have not been examined.

Shri L. N. Mishra: May I know whether the creation of this fund would involve any change in the existing financial and accounting procedure relating to irrigation works?

Shri Hathi: There will be no change in the accounting procedure in this behalf.

Shri S. C. Samanta: May I know whether this development fund will include the loan from beneficiaries as contemplated by the Planning Commission?

Shri Hathi: It would normally include that.

श्री एन० एल० जोशी : जिन २ राज्यों में यह फंड बन चुके हैं, उन में अभी तक केन्द्रीय सरकार ने कितनी सहायता दी है ?

Shri Hathi: This fund has been created only by Madhya Pradesh, and by no other State.

Shri A. M. Thomas: May I know whether Government have any idea of the exact amount so far contributed to this fund?

Shri Hathi: Only Madhya Pradesh has a fund, and I think, initially they had some Rs. 10 lakhs.

Shri B. K. Das: May I know whether some basis will be adopted for levying betterment fees?

Shri Hathi: It will depend upon the States themselves.

Shri L. N. Mishra: May I know whether the receipts from betterment fees, water rate and irrigation cess are to go to constitute this fund?

Shri Hathi: Yes. They will form a part of this betterment fund.

Shri N. Somana: What is the percentage of Central grant to this fund?

Shri Hathi: It will depend upon each particular project first.

SALT PETER INDUSTRY

***1619. Shri M. N. Singh:** Will the Minister of **Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state:

(a) the condition of salt peter industry at present in India;

(b) the amount of salt peter imported from abroad before, during and after the World War II, and produced during the same period within the country; and

(c) what steps Government are taking to improve the condition of this industry and the labourers engaged in this industry?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): (a) to (c). A statement is placed on the Table of the House. [*See* Appendix X, annexure No. 22.]

Shri Dhusia: May I know whether this industry is self-sufficient, and if it is not, what are the difficulties of making it self-sufficient?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: If "self-sufficiency" means whether we import potassium nitrate, I might say that although we have given a quota of 40 per cent. for imports, nothing really comes in. Apparently, what is produced here is adequate. We also export small quantities. In 1950-51, we exported 215 tons. In 1951-52 we exported 99 tons, and a smaller quantity in the next six months—28 tons. But the estimated possibilities of production are somewhere in the region of 5,000 tons. The actual production falls short of it, and ranges between 3,000 tons and below? All that I can say is that there does seem to be enough potassium nitrate for the purposes on hand, though we do import a different type of nitrate, called Chilean nitrate, for agricultural purposes and also for industrial purposes

TEA CHESTS

*1620. **Shri S. C. Samanta:** (a) Will the Minister of Commerce and Industry be pleased to state whether the plywood industry is getting sufficient amount of Andaman woods to manufacture tea-chests?

(b) If so, what amount of wood was supplied to the industry in the year 1951-52?

(c) When is the plywood industry in India expected to export tea-chests to other countries?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): (a) and (b). 10,670 tons of Andaman ply logs were supplied which covered about 35 per cent. of the requirements of factories in Calcutta area.

(c) Export of tea chests is already on the Open General Licence.

Shri S. C. Samanta: May I know whether the plywood industry in India is using woods other than Andaman woods, and whether they are also using imported woods?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: If Andaman woods form only 35 per cent. of the total requirements of our plywood industry, as I have stated in the answer, it follows that they are using other woods, but I believe they are largely using what is produced internally.

Shri S. C. Samanta: The hon. Minister said that the export of tea chests is in the O. G. L. May I know whether any amount has been exported to Ceylon and what is the ground for refusal of the exported goods by Ceylon?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I would like to have notice.

Shri Sarmah: Has India produced her full requirements of tea chests?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: For the current half year, we are not allowing any imports. It therefore follows that what we produce is adequate.

Kumari Annie Mascarene: May I know whether Government have received any complaints that our tea chests do not stand the wear and tear of export?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Government have received no specific complaints, but they have seen complaints in the newspapers.

Shri Punnoose: May I know whether the maximum use is made of the available plywood in the country, and may I also know the States from which it is supplied?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: In regard to the first question, it is a matter of opinion. If no plywood is imported, then apparently the maximum use is made of plywood available in the country. If the hon. Member wants information with regard to State-wise production, I would like to have notice.

Shri N. M. Lingam: May I know whether it is a fact that the sale of our tea in countries like the U.S.A. is handicapped by the poor quality of our tea chests, and if so, what steps are being taken by Government to improve the quality of our tea chests?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: The Indian Standards Institution have prescribed certain standards for tea chest and there is a voluntary system of inspection now in vogue in order to see that the quality is maintained. I have seen complaints, particularly in U. K. papers, about the quality of our tea chests. At the same time, I have also seen encomiums paid to our plywood manufacturers by experts. Recently, there was an expert here under one of the technical aid programmes—a gentleman by name Mr. Cramer. He has been speaking everywhere and his speeches are reported in the papers He has said that the quality of Indian plywood is quite as good as the plywood produced in any other country.

Shri Matthen: May I know whether the plywood factories in Malabar and Travancore-Cochin are fed entirely by the timber from that area, or are they depending upon imported timber also?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: For specific questions regarding particular areas, I must ask for notice.

COMMUNITY PROJECTS

***1621. Shri L. N. Mishra:** Will the Minister of **Planning** be pleased to state:

(a) the amount spent so far on the community projects that are under progress and results achieved in each case;

(b) whether it is a fact that complaints of delay in sanction of fund for the community projects works have been made to the Government of India; and

(c) if so, what action has been taken thereon?

The Deputy Minister of Irrigation and Power (Shri Hathi): (a) The total expenditure incurred on community projects upto 31st December 1952 is Rs. 15,15,128. A summary of the quarterly report for each Project/Block is laid on the Table. [*Placed in Library. See* No. S-41/53.]

(b) There were some complaints in the initial stages.

(c) Programmes and budgets have been finalised after personal discussion with the representatives of the State Governments. Powers have been delegated to Devlopment Commissioners in most of the States with a view to giving speedy sanction to schemes. The other States which have not delegated powers have been asked to take early action in this regard.

Shri L. N. Mishra: May I know whether it is a fact that the progress of the community projects has suffered for want of inter-departmental co-operation and for want of suppliers and equipments.

Shri Hathi: In the initial stages, there was this difficulty. Subsequently, just after a couple of months the powers were delegated to the Development Commissioners, and thereafter the progress has been satisfactory in most of the cases.

Shri L. N. Mishra: May I know whether any evaluation of works done by these projects have been conducted by the Planning Commission, and if so, what have been their findings?

Shri Hathi: The Planning Commission has set up an evaluation section. The officers in this section will tour round and look to the results, and find out what work has yet to be done.

Shrimati Tarkheshwari Sinha: May I know whether the project officers have made any contacts with the authorities of the colleges in regard to the students participating in the community development projects, and if so, may I know whether Government have sanctioned any money for the boarding, lodging and transport arrangements of such students?

Shri Hathi: Yes, Sir. The project officers and the State Governments have contacted students. In fact, in one of the States the engineering students and the medical students of the college did visit the project area. They did work in the engineering part of it and also in the health part of it.

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha: Can I have an idea of the number of colleges participating in this way?

Shri Hathi: I cannot give the exact number, but there were two or three colleges which did take part.

Shri A. M. Thomas: The Prime Minister is reported to have recorded that Assam leads in the matter of the progress achieved so far. Are there any special reasons for the same? May I enquire why other States have lagged behind especially because the official pattern and control are the same? Is it because of powers have not been delegated?

The Prime Minister (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): I did express my gratification at the work done in Assam. I accept the same thing in regard to a number of other centres. It is rather difficult to go in for invidious comparisons in this matter, but I would like to say, after going through all the reports, that roughly speaking 25 per cent. of the Community Project centres are doing extraordinarily well—that is far beyond expectations. About 30 per cent. or so are doing well; about another 30 or 35 per cent. are doing fairly well and about 10 per cent. are doing badly. That is the general impression I have formed.

Shri Punnoose: Are the black sheep (the community project centres) which were behaving badly, now behaving better?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: When I said they were bad, it simply means that no work is being done. There is no question of badness. It only means that no progress has been made.

Shri L. N. Mishra: May I know whether it is a fact that along with community projects an extension service in the nature of a permanent organisation is being inaugurated and if so how that organisation is proposed to work along with the community projects?

Shri Hathi: Yes, Sir: An extension service is going to be organised. It will be a permanent thing. The community projects will be an intensified programme of this National Extension Service.

श्री एन. एल. जोशी : क्या लाल फीताशाही के कारण रुपये की स्वीकृति में देर होने से आजकल काम्युनिटी प्राजेक्ट के कई काम रुके हुए हैं ?

Shri Hathi: No, not now. It was in the beginning, as I said.

Shri Matthen: May I know whether Government considers the progress of the two Community Projects in Travancore-Cochin satisfactory—are they keeping up to schedule?

Shri Hathi: I think both of them are doing well But if he wants particulars I shall enquire into that.

बाबू रामनारायन सिंह : जिन काम्युनिटी प्राजेक्ट में अच्छा काम हो रहा है, जैसा कि अभी प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने कहा, वहां पर तलब पाने वाले केवल सरकारी अफसर ही काम करते हैं या वास्तव में लोगों के सहयोग से सुन्दर काम हो रहा है।

श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरु : दोनों बातें हैं, जब दोनों का जोड़ होता है तब गाड़ी तेज चलती है ।

CHECK ON QUALITY OF YARN

*1622. **Shri Tulsidas:** (a) Will the Minister of Commerce and Industry be pleased to state whether the Textile Commissioner's office maintains a proper check on cotton yarn produced by mills with a view to ascertain that the yarns exactly correspond with the count specified on the bundle and that it is not below the minimum strength specified for the same before being supplied for consumption?

(b) Has the Textile Commissioner received complaints from the consumers and the trade regarding poor quality of yarn either differing in count or being below the minimum strength provided for?

(c) If so, what action has the Textile Commissioner taken in this matter?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): (a) Periodical checks are carried out by the Textile Commissioner's Inspection staff. A continuous check in every mill is not possible.

(b) and (c). Such complaints are received from time to time. Where the defective yarn has already been passed on to the dealer or consumer and if it is noticed that there was no *malafide* intention on the part of the mill, then the Mill is asked to take back the yarn and to refund the amount charged and the mill is asked to re-stamp the prices prescribed. Where the *bona fides* of the Mills are not established, then action to prosecute the Mill in question under the provisions of the Cotton Textiles (Control) Order, 1948, is taken.

Shri K. C. Sodhia: May I know in how many cases such action was taken against the mills during last year?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I have a list of about 21 here in which action of various types was taken.

CHECK ON QUALITY OF CLOTH

*1623. **Shri Tulsidas:** Will the Minister of Commerce and Industry be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Textile Commissioner's office maintains proper check to see that the cloth sample supplied by the mills is according to the particulars furnished before fixing the price;

(b) whether any watch is being maintained during the process to verify that the cloth produced corresponds with the sample and the particulars furnished for fixing the price; and

(c) what steps are taken to see that the cloth put in the market corresponds to the sample cloth?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): (a) and (b). Periodical checks are made by the Officers of the Textile Commissioner to ensure that cloth actually being processed is according to the specifications and that the samples correspond with the particulars given in the price form furnished by the mills.

(c) Test inspections are carried out by the Officers of the Textile Commissioner. Complaints received from the public are investigated into and appropriate action is taken.

Shri Tulsidas: May I know what further steps are being taken for checking the specifications, because there has been a number of complaints with regard to quality, particularly in the matter of exports?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Well, Sir, even in regard to exports the same type of action is contemplated and is taken in certain cases. Sometimes we use our export control mechanism which we had in the past—even now it is a question of licensing—to prevent mills which are producing sub-standard quality, from exporting. As regards the question of providing a machinery to look into quality control of exports, the matter is now being discussed between the Cotton Textile Fund Committee and the interests concerned.

Shri Tulsidas: As a result of this check by the Textile Commissioner, has there been any improvement in the quality of cloth exported?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Well, Sir, really, I think the hon. member would be better able to express an opinion in this matter than myself, because he knows that side of the trade over which I have less control. In fact, Government control is over the industry as such, not over trade. The hon. Member is more familiar with the trade. But it is rather difficult to say whether these complaints are increasing or decreasing. At the present moment our export position is none too happy and I think the people interested would understand that supplying sub-standard quality would only make the position worse. Whether there is a realisation of this fact is more than what I can say.

Shri Kelappan: May I know whether any cases have been brought to the notice of Government?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: That is precisely the thing that is being done. In the prescribed form which is sent by a Mill to the Textile Commissioner's Office, a bit of cloth 6" × 6" is attached and that is tested Wherever there is a suspicion, laboratory tests are made and if we find that instead of 18 × 18, it is 18 × 15 and the prices charged are the same, then the mill is asked to explain; sometimes prosecution ensues.

Shri Kelappan: May I know whether any such case against any mill has been brought to the notice of Government?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I cannot quite understand the import of that question. What I said is that it is a continuous process. It is not an isolated case.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: What he wants to know is whether any of the purchasers have made any complaints?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I should like to mention that in the case of one mill we have not permitted exports last year. After giving them some time they have asked for a review of their case and it is being considered now. Such action as is appropriate is being taken in every instance, when complaints are brought to the notice of Government and they are substantiated.

Kumari Annie Mascarene: May I know whether Government's attention has ever been drawn to the bad quality of our cloth, by our trade missions abroad?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Yes, sometimes we have complaints. In fact, we sent out an officer of the Textile Commissioner's office on a tour of South-East Asia and questions were asked in this House about the report of that officer. The report did indicate that there were complaints against the quality of cloth not being up to sample.

श्री गणपति राम : क्या मैं जान सकता हूं कि कुछ मिलों को धोती और साड़ी के प्रोडक्शन के लिए छूट दे दी गयी है ?

Shri Tulsidas: May I know whether these complaints are on the increase or on the decrease after the machinery of check was instituted?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I could not say that, Sir. I have had no evaluation of the number of complaints. If the hon. Member puts down a question, I will make an attempt to answer it.

CLOTH

*1624. **Shri Tulsidas:** (a) Will the Minister of **Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state whether the

Textile Commissioner's Office come across cases where cloth put in the market was not according to the serial number given on the cloth?

(b) If so, what steps have been taken against the defaulting mills?

(c) Has the Textile Commissioner received complaints from the traders about the quality and defects in the cloth?

(d) If so, what steps have been taken in this matter?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): (a) to (d). A Statement is laid on the Table of the House. [*See* Appendix X, annexure No. 23.]

TIMBER IMPORT

***1625. Shri Sanganna:** Will the Minister of **Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state:

(a) the value of timber imported to India from abroad;

(b) whether imported timber is to supplement the supply position of timber in the country; and

(c) whether foreign timber is imported from the point of view of standard?

The Minister of Commerce (Shri Karmarkar): (a) A statement is laid on the Table of the House.

(b) and (c). Mainly to supplement the indigenous supply and to a certain extent from the point of view of quality.

STATEMENT

Value of Timber imported to India from abroad.

Year		Value
		Rs.
1950-51	...	2,79,15,618
1951-52	...	5,56,03,894
1952-53	...	1,73,85,171
(April to December 1952).		

Shri Sanganna: May I know, Sir, how the price of the imported timber, compares with that of Indian timber?

Shri Karmarkar: It is costlier than the indigenous timber.

Shri Matthen: May I know, Sir, whether the hon. Minister be pleased to persuade the Central Ministries like the Railways, the C.P.W.D., etc., to take more and more of the South Indian teak, so as to reduce the import of foreign teak?

Shri Karmarkar: Wherever suitable indigenous teak is utilised.

श्री भक्त दर्शन : मैं जानना चाहता हूं कि किस किस प्रकार की इमारती लकड़ी किस किस देश से आयात की जाती है और क्या इस से हमारे देश के लकड़ी व्यापार को हानि नहीं पहुंच रही है ?

श्री करमरकर : जी नहीं, हम बर्मा से लकड़ी मंगाते हैं और जिस किस्म की टीक हमें चाहिये उसी किस्म की और जितनी चाहिये उतनी ही मंगाते हैं।

Shri A. M. Thomas: Has there been an insistence by the Public Works Department to use Burma teak instead of indigenous teak?

Shri Karmarkar: I think my hon. colleague for public works will be able to answer that better than I can.

Shri Thanu Pillai: May I know whether any timber is being exported from India?

Shri Karmarkar: Yes, Sir, to a small extent.

Shri S. C. Samanta: May I know whether the Andaman timber is being seasoned now at Port Blair and, if so, how does it compare with the teak imported from Burma?

Shri Karmarkar: About seasoning I would like to have notice. But at the present moment. Burma teak, of particular varieties, is supposed to be better than the Indian teak.

FILMS ON TRIBAL PEOPLE

***1626. Shri Rishang Keishing:** Will the Minister of **Information and Broadcasting** be pleased to state:

(a) whether any team of officials or non-officials has been sent out by the Government of India to film the modes of life and the various aspects of arts and culture of the tribal people and other backward classes in India;

(b) whether any educative propaganda is carried on by means of films in the backward and tribal areas to acquaint the people there of the superior modes of life and current affairs elsewhere; and

(c) whether there is a proposal in hand to provide the high schools in the backward tribal areas with radio-sets free of cost in order to keep the tribal and the backward-class students abreast of the current events?

The Minister of Information and Broadcasting (Dr. Keskar): (a) Yes, Sir. Units of the Films Division have been deputed for the purpose from time to time.

(b) and (c). These matters concern State Governments; it may however be mentioned that documentary films produced by the Films Division are exhibited in the areas, while community receiver sets have also been installed for the reception of radio programmes, in certain places.

MEETING OF PRIME MINISTERS OF INDIA AND BURMA

*1628. **Shri Rishang Keishing:** Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state:

(a) the main purpose in broad outline for which the two Prime Ministers of India and Burma met each other in the eastern borders of India; and

(b) whether the question of security measures for the common frontier, the development problem of Nagas on either side of the border and also the question of demarcation of the boundary between the two countries figured in the talks?

The Prime Minister (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): (a) and (b). The meeting took place at the invitation of the Prime Minister of Burma. It was an informal meeting and the main purpose was to further the friendly relations so happily existing between the two Governments and peoples. Questions relating to the development and welfare of the tribal people on both sides of the border were discussed. There was no discussion about security measures on the frontier area or about the demarcation of the boundary.

Shri Rishang Keishing: May I know whether any decisions were arrived at between the two Prime Ministers about the development of the Tribals in the Indo-Burma frontier areas and, if so, what are those decisions?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: There is no question of any decisions: it is a question of looking at how things were being done on either side and learning from them mutually.

Shri Rishang Keishing: The hon. the Prime Minister in his speech at Kohima was reported to have blamed the outsiders for misleading the Nagas. May I know who those outsiders are?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I have referred to this matter at some length elsewhere. I can hardly deal with it in an answer—I cannot spot an individual like this and state it. The answer would be an answer going as far back to the days when British rule was here, how the British officials encouraged certain things, how subsequently some others have gone on encouraging these.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: May I know whether any development programme was discussed by the two Prime Ministers?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I should like the House to appreciate that neither Government wishes to interfere with the work done by the other Government; nor is there any joint programme. We have different ways of working, and we learn from each other. What we saw there gave us some ideas as to what we might do here; what the Burmese Prime Minister saw on our side gave him some ideas.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: May I know whether the outsiders other than the British officials, about whom the hon. Prime Minister just referred, are still in that area?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am not referring to individuals. If any individual does that he is forthwith removed. I am referring to groups. If any individual obviously behaves in a wrong way, well, he won't be allowed to remain there long.

Shri Biren Dutt: Has there been an arrest of some persons there and, if so, may I know whether they belong to these categories?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not know to what reports the hon. Member is referring. I have seen some reports in the press which, if I may say so, are fantastically wrong—nothing to do with the actual facts of the case. Some local trouble has occurred —nothing to do with any other matter —and some local arrests have been made. In one instance there was some trouble, a private feud between two parties. All this is made out as if there is some political development. Three or four arrests have been made so far—I do not know the exact number, but a very small number, under the ordinary law. But it has nothing to do with this question of Nagas.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: Is it a fact that certain Naga organisations intended to present a memorandum to the Prime Minister when he was addressing a meeting at Kohima and that memorandum was not allowed to be presented, by the Deputy Commissioner for certain reasons?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: No, that is not correct. What happened, I believe, was that the Deputy Commissioner informed them that if they wished to present a memorandum, that was not the right place—a public meeting—and after the meeting they could come and present it.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: We have heard that there has been an arrest of a particular person who is supposed to be the Secretary of the Naga National Conference. May I know whether that has any political background or it was due to some personal feud?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I could not say particularly about that. But if it is, he must have been charged with some offence under the criminal law. So far as I know, no persons have been arrested merely because they are indulging in some kind of agitation or something but because they have offended against some law.

Babu Ramnarayan Singh: One question.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Next question. I have allowed a number of supplementaries on this.

SOIL CONSERVATION IN KOSI VALLEY

*1629. **Shri S. N. Das:** (a) Will the Minister of **Irrigation and Power** be pleased to state whether and if so, what steps have so far been taken with regard to soil conservation measures for reducing the heavy silt charge in the river Kosi as recommended by the Kosi Advisory Committee?

(b) What is the total estimated expenditure to be incurred for the purpose?

(c) Have the Governments of Bihar and Nepal been asked to assist in this work?

(d) If so, in what way are they co-operating?

(e) What is the total expenditure that has been incurred, so far, on it?

The Deputy Minister of Irrigation and Power (Shri Hathi): (a) No actual soil conservation measures have so far been carried out in the Kosi Catchment area. Only preliminary surveys have been carried out, and more detailed surveys are necessary for drawing up a practical scheme for soil conservation in the catchment. The proposal for detailed surveys is under examination of the Government in consultation with the Planning Commission.

(b) The estimated expenditure has not yet been worked out.

(c) Not yet.

(d) and (e). Do not arise.

Shri S. N. Das: May I know whether the Government of Nepal and the Government of Bihar have been consulted in this matter and have been asked to take some measures for this purpose.

Shri Hathi: The Government of Bihar have been consulted. So far as the Government of Nepal is concerned, it is yet premature.

Shri S. N. Das: May I know whether any allotment has been made in this budget for this purpose?

Shri Hathi: The estimates have not been made. They will take more time.

HANDLOOM INDUSTRY

*1630. **Shri K. P. Sinha:** Will the Minister of **Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state whether it is a fact that the number of working handlooms has decreased this year?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): Government have no precise information.

Shri Punnoose: May I know what practical steps have been taken by the Government to help the handloom industry?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We are going away from that.

Shri Punnoose: What steps have been taken by Government to increase the number of working handlooms?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: If the hon. Member wants to plant a tree and plants a seed for that purpose, he should see that it goes into the earth and not dig it and see whether it has sprouted. The hon. Member must wait for some time.

ALLOCATION OF SCARCE RAW MATERIALS

*1631. **Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy:** (a) Will the Minister of **Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state the machinery set up to determine the allocation of scarce raw materials to different industries?

(b) What is the criteria of distribution?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): (a) and (b). I am afraid that the question is wide as well as vague. The nature of the arrangements for the distribution of scarce raw materials to industries will naturally depend upon the degree of scarcity, relative essentiality of the various purposes for which the material is used, the possibility of substitution etc. All these factors vary from time to time and suitable adjustments have to be made. I am unable to say more in answer to this very general question but if the hon. Member desires information regarding any particular raw-material, he may put a separate question.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: I did not get any answer to my question at part (b).

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: The criteria employed in regard to distribution of scarce material vary from scarce material to scarce material and according to the nature and the degree of scarcity existing at the time. For instance, I may mention that today on the question of distribution of steel, we are fairly liberal because the off-take in certain types of steel is not very high and the position changes from quarter to quarter. In regard to pig iron, the position is slightly different because the commodity is getting scarce. All steel plants are using more pig iron themselves and we have not got enough pig iron capacity in this country. Similarly in regard to copper, the distribution of this material was scarce. Today, it is no longer scarce. The same thing in regard to sulphur. It was a very scarce commodity last year and quite a number of our plants which were using sulphur had to restrict production. Today, sulphur is no longer scarce and the necessity for distribution is not there. So, how could I, Sir, lay down any precise set of criteria for distribution of scarce material?

Some Hon. Members *rose*—

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It is a general question and a general answer has been given.

HANDICRAFTS MARKETING CONFERENCE

***1632. Shri M. L. Agrawal:** (a) Will the Minister of Commerce and Industry be pleased to state whether a Handicrafts Marketing Conference was held in Trivandrum in February 1953?

(b) At whose instance was the conference called and what was the object and outcome of the same?

(c) How many hours did the conference last?

(d) What was the total expenditure incurred in holding the conference?

(e) Were the minutes of the proceedings recorded?

(f) If so, do Government propose to place a copy thereof on the Table of the House?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) The conference was held at the instance of the All-India Handicrafts Board to discuss the marketing of Handicrafts in India as well as abroad. The conference recommended the setting up of a Central Co-ordinating Agency for marketing Handicrafts.

(c) Very nearly four hours.

(d) As the conference was held just after the Handicrafts Board's meeting and as the members of the Handicrafts Board who attended the Marketing Conference drew T. A. and daily allowance for attending the Board meeting, no additional expenditure on travelling and daily allowances in connection with the Marketing Conference was incurred.

(e) Yes, Sir.

(f) A copy of the proceedings of the Conference is laid on the Table of the House. [*Placed in Library. See No. S-43/53.*]

Shri M. L. Agrawal: May I know the names of the States which participated in this conference? Is it a fact that some States could not participate as the place where the conference was held was not a central place?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I have got a list of participants here. I have not had it analysed Statewise. It is quite possible that some States did not participate because of the distance but then it was felt that the area is sufficiently important for the conference to be held.

Shri M. L. Agrawal: May I know whether the conclusions reached in this conference were unanimous, and which of them have been implemented so far?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I would suggest to the hon. Member to read the proceedings placed on the Table of the

House and he can form his own conclusions.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: May I know whether this Board has come into existence? If not, will it come into existence in the near future—the Marketing Board?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: There is no Marketing Board as such. I understand they wanted to have a Central Marketing Board. We have not brought it into existence.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: Was there any definite decision taken about the setting up of a Marketing Board?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: As I have said, I would like to suggest to the hon. Member to read the proceedings and then the hon. Member would know what has been said. These are in the nature of proposals that Government have to examine.

Shri Punnoose: It was stated that some States did not take part in that conference because it was held at a distant place. May I know the number of States which participated in this conference?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I have not got an analysis of the States which participated; all that I admitted was that some States might not have participated for the reason of the distance. At any rate I can assure the hon. Member that his State must have participated in full.

BELTING

***1633. Prof. D. C. Sharma:** (a) Will the Minister of **Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state whether rubber, cotton, hair and leather belting is manufactured in India?

(b) How do the rates of the Indian belting compare with foreign belting?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) Indigenous beltings are cheaper than the imported ones.

Prof. D. C. Sharma: May I know whether all kinds of belting are manufactured in India?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: The hon. Member has categorised various types of belting, cotton, hair and leather belting. In regard to cotton and hair belting, Calcutta seems to be a very important centre. In regard to leather belting, the emphasis is shifted from Calcutta to some extent, not altogether. Some go to Kanpur, some go to Madras. Then, so far as the rubber belting is concerned, again Calcutta dominates the field.

Prof. D. C. Sharma: May I know if beltings of these kinds are also imported into India?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I would like the question to be repeated.

Prof. D. C. Sharma: May I know if these types of belting are imported into India even though our rates are cheaper than those imported?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Some belting is imported. It is not a mere matter of rate. It is a matter of quality. In regard to leather belting, the quality is not supposed to be as good and we are now exploring the possibility of improving the quality by allowing local manufacturers to get some foreign technicians or foreign participation. The main purpose in the matter of belting is not to keep the belting industry going but an industry which it seeks to serve going.

Prof. D. C. Sharma: May I know what specific steps the Ministry is taking to improve the quality of belting?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: My hon. friend has a great precision in words and if he would say on what category of belting he wants to know the information, I shall be glad to answer that.

BUILDINGS IN SIMLA

***1634. Prof. D. C. Sharma:** Will the Minister of **Works, Housing and Supply** be pleased to state:

(a) the approximate value of the buildings belonging to the Government of India situated in Simla; and

(b) what use Government intend to make of them after the Punjab Government shift to Chandigarh?

The Deputy Minister of Works, Housing and Supply (Shri Buragohain): (a) About Rs. 234 lakhs.

(b) The matter is under examination.

Prof. D. C. Sharma: May I know what use is going to be made of the different categories of accommodation available in Simla, for instance, the Viceregal House.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member can put down a straightforward question.

Shri Buragohain: This is a hypothetical question. I believe such of the offices as could be sent out from Delhi can be located at Simla.

Prof. D. C. Sharma: May I know what use will be made of the surplus residential accommodation in Simla?

Shri Buragohain: If we succeed in persuading offices to move to Simla, certain residential accommodation can be made available for use by these offices.

Prof. D. C. Sharma: What particular use will be made of the residence of the Viceroy and the Governor-General of India?

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: Is there any proposal to convert this Viceregal lodge into a sanatorium or college?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It is a suggestion for action.

SURGICAL INSTRUMENTS

*1635. **Prof. D. C. Sharma:** Will the Minister of **Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state:

(a) whether surgical instruments are manufactured in the Punjab;

(b) whether these instruments can compete in price and quality with foreign instruments; and

(c) if not, the reasons therefor?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) It is understood that they do not.

(c) The reasons are understood to be amongst others lack of proper raw materials, proper heat treatment and nickel plating.

Prof. D. C. Sharma: May I know what are the Centres for the manufacture of these instruments?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I believe, Punjab, Sir.

Shri G. P. Sinha: Are they carried on a cottage industry basis?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: It might be; but not strictly in cottages.

Prof. D. C. Sharma: Is it a fact that Batala used to be a famous centre and may I know what steps have been taken to rehabilitate this industry in Batala in Gurdaspur district?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: May be; my information is derived from the Government of Punjab. They are opening a development centre at Sonepat.

TOBACCO EXPORT TRADE

*1636. **Shri C. R. Chowdary:** (a) Will the Minister of **Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state the value in rupees of our annual exports in tobacco in the years 1950 to 1953, State-wise?

(b) What steps had been taken to expand the export trade in tobacco in the years 1951-52 and 1952-53?

(c) Have Government sent any trade delegation either to the west or to the east to study the scope for expansion of our tobacco trade?

The Minister of Commerce (Shri Karmarkar): (a) and (b). Attention is invited to reply given to parts (a) and (c) of Unstarred Question No. 557 on 16th March. 1953 and to part (a) of Starred Question No. 594 on 9th March, 1953. Figures for 1953 are not yet available. Statistics of exports are not complied according to the area of production.

(c) No, Sir.

Shri C. R. Chowdary: May I know what steps have been taken to collect data as to the quantity of tobacco, out of the 1952 crop, still lying in the godowns for want of marketing facilities, external and internal?

Shri Karmarkar: I shall consult my esteemed colleague in the Food and Agriculture Ministry and let the hon. Member know.

Shri Dabhi: May I know whether there are any restrictions as regards the quantity of export of tobacco from this country?

Shri Karmarkar: I do not think so; I should like to verify.

Shri C. R. Chowdary: May I know what special interest is taken to see that the stocks lying in the godowns in the various places, of the 1952 crop, are disposed of in the internal or external market?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): The point is this. So far as general promotion of export of tobacco is concerned, we are trying to do what we can through the machinery that we have at our disposal. Tobacco forms part of practically every trade agreement that we have concluded with foreign countries. The precise nature of the steps that could be token to relieve the pressure now existing in the tobacco trade is a matter to be considered. Undoubtedly, it is true that the 1952 exports are less than the exports in 1951, and very possibly that is due to the complaints that we have received about the people who are importing this tobacco not appreciating its quality. If my hon. friend refers to the reply to unstarred question No. 557 dated 16th March, furnished by the Food and Agriculture Ministry, he will understand that certain steps are being taken. We are considering this matter in conjunction with the Food and Agriculture Ministry. I can assure the hon. Member that both the Food and Agriculture Ministry and the Commerce Ministry will do what they can for this particular industry.

Shri S. V. L. Narasimham: In view of the statement laid before the House, may I know whether the I. L. T. D. Co. and other big tobacco concerns in Guntur district have abstained from participating in the auctions held at the market yards of the Tobacco Committee.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I should like to have notice.

Shri C. R. Chowdary: May I know whether the Government intend to send out a delegation to study the market conditions in various countries abroad?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: No such proposal has come from the concerned interests. Specifically if any such proposal comes, we will consider it favourably.

Shri B. S. Murthy: Is it not a fact that there is an Officer in the U. K. or Paris,—I do not exactly know where he is—for seeing that the export facilities for Indian tobacco are improved? May I know whether that officer has been kept informed about the large stocks of 1952 tobacco still lying?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I am not sure whether there is an officer attached now to the High Commissioner. But, I think the High Commissioner's office is adequately staffed to look after our tobacco interests as well. As I said, amongst other reasons, one of the reasons for the falling off of exports is the general complaint that we have received about the quality. These matters are being considered. As I said, if any specific representation comes from the industry, the Food and Agriculture Ministry and the Commerce and Industry Ministry will certainly do what they can.

Shri Ramachandra Reddi: Is it a fact that the higher grade tobacco exported to foreign markets is called Virginia tobacco and the lower grades that are exported are called Indian tobacco in the foreign markets?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I should like to have notice to give a precise answer.

Shri Matthen: May I know whether the hon. Minister is aware that Jaffna tobacco is imported into India and can he not help the Indian tobacco by stopping that?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: That is a different question. A question has been tabled and an aswer given.

Shri Nanadas: May I know the countries to which we export our tobacco?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: If I could turn over the notes, I can give that information. I would prefer to be more precise. If the hon. Member can put down a question, the information can be supplied. He can get it from the sea-borne trade publications.

WAR REPARATIONS FROM GERMANY

***1637. Dr. Ram Subhag Singh:** Will the Minister of **Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state what India has got as her share of war (World War II) reparations from Germany?

The Minister of Commerce (Shri Karmarkar): Reparations so far received from Germany comprise—

(A) German external assets within the jurisdiction of India, proceeds of liquidation of German assets in neutral and ex-enemy countries and U.S.S.R. reciprocal deliveries.

(B) Industrial plants and other capital equipment removed from Germany. In this connection I would invite the Hon'ble Member's attention to the reply given by the Deputy Minister for Works, Housing and Supply to Unstarred Question No. 1045 by Shri L. J. Singh on the 15th April, 1953 in the House of the People. 10,431 items of general purposes machine tools and other industrial Capital Equipment have been received by India from Germany as reparations.

The total monetary value of these reparations is estimated to be of the order of Rs. 10 crores.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: May I know whether the machine-tools and industrial equipment that has been received into India, also included Pakistan's share of war reparations, or whether Pakistan received her share separately?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): A question was answered the other day in regard to this matter, *viz.*, the claim made by Pakistan that India has not given to her her share, and I do not think we can add anything more to it.

Shri G. P. Sinha: May I know whether there are two different channels of East and West Germany for getting reparations from them?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I am unable to understand the question. If a specific question is put down, I will answer.

Shri G. P. Sinha: In view of the fact that East Germany is in the Russian zone and West Germany is in the American zone, do we get reparations differently from these countries?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member is only giving arguments.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: The whole thing is under one Inter-allied reparation agency. It must be presumed naturally that in the allocation of reparations, where the physical assets are in the eastern section, those countries which have access to them would be given the materials that are available there.

INDIANS IN U.N.O. SECRETARIAT

*1638. **Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha:** Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state:

(a) the number of Indians working in the Secretariat of the U.N.O.;

(b) what is the normal channel of their appointment; and

(c) the number of persons who have resigned from the service of U.N.O. since 1950?

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shri Anil K. Chanda): (a) 52.

(b) Persons seeking employment in the U. N. Secretariat normally apply to the Secretary-General of the United Nations either direct or through the Government of India or the Permanent Representative of the Government of India to the U. N. at New York. Authority to make appointments rests solely in the Secretary-General.

(c) The Government of India have no information.

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha: May I know if the Indians employed in the U. N. enjoy full diplomatic immunity or are they governed by United States laws?

Shri Anil K. Chanda: All the principal officers of the U. N. enjoy diplomatic immunity.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The Question Hour is over.

WRITTEN ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY MINISTRY PRESS

*1616. { **Sardar Hukam Singh:**
{ **Shri Bahadur Singh:**

(a) Will the Minister of **Works, Housing and Supply** be pleased to state when the administrative control of the late Commerce and Industry Ministry Press was transferred to the Stationery and Printing Department?

(b) Has this transfer resulted in any economy of expenditure?

The Deputy Minister of Works, Housing and Supply (Shri Buragohain): (a) On 2nd January, 1952.

(b) Yes, Sir.

भारत में अहमदियों का प्रवेश

*१६३७. श्री रघुनाथ सिंह : क्या प्रधान मंत्री यह बतलाने की कृपा करेंगे :

(क) क्या यह सत्य है कि पश्चिमी पाकिस्तान के कुछ अहमदिया मुसलमान पश्चिमी पंजाब के हाल के उपद्रवों के पश्चात् सीमा पार करके भारत आना चाहते थे और उन्हें सीमा पार रोक दिया गया था ; और

(ख) क्या कुछ अहमदिया मुसलमान भारत में प्रविष्ट हो गये हैं अथवा उन्होंने इस के लिए आवेदन किया है ?

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shri Anil K. Chanda): (a) and (b). So far as is known to the Government, no such attempts to enter India have been made.

FILMS FOR PROJECT AREAS

*1639. **Shri L. J. Singh:** Will the Minister of **Information and Broadcasting** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that films which will be informational and instructional in nature dealing with work on projects, including some in the form of stories and entertainment shorts for the recreation of people in the project areas, will be produced;

(b) whether Government have considered the question of producing such films in Indian languages other than Hindi, Bengali, Tamil and Telugu;

(c) whether Government have considered the desirability of producing such films in the regional languages of the States; and

(d) what are the Indian languages in which Government are contemplating to produce such films?

The Minister of Information and Broadcasting (Dr. Keskar): (a) to (c) Yes, Sir.

(d) In addition to Hindi, Bengali, Tamil and Telugu in which films are produced at present, it is proposed to dub these films in Malayalam, Kannada, Gujrati and Marathi. Selected films may also be dubbed in Punjabi, Oriya and Assamese.

मांस और मछली का निर्यात

***१६४०. श्री बलवन्त सिंह मेहता:** क्या वाणिज्य तथा उद्योग मंत्री यह बतलाने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) भारत से प्रति वर्ष कितने मूल्य के तथा कितनी मात्रा में मांस, मछली और अंडों का निर्यात किया जाता है ; और

(ख) किन किन देशों को इन का निर्यात किया जाता है ?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): (a) and (b). Export of meat and eggs is not recorded separately in official statistics. A statement showing exports of fish destinationwise during the last three years is placed on the Table of the House. [*See* Appendix X, annexure No. 24.]

STATE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE FOR MANIPUR

***1643. Shri L. J. Singh:** (a) Will the Minister of **Planning** be pleased to state whether a State Development Committee was constituted for supervising the implementation of the Community Projects Schemes and the other projects included in the Five Year Plan for Manipur State?

(b) If so, what is the composition of the Committee?

(c) Have the members of Parliament representing Manipur State, been taken in the Committee, as in the case of Kutch?

(d) If not, do Government propose to take them in the Committee?

The Deputy Minister of Irrigation and Power (Shri Hathi): (a) No.

(b) to (d). Do not arise.

MASONRY WELLS

***1644. Shri Badshah Gupta:** Will the Minister of **Planning** be pleased to state whether there is any scheme under the Five Year Plan to subsidise the sinking of masonry wells in different States in areas where canal and tube-well irrigation facilities are not contemplated to be made available under the Plan?

The Deputy Minister of Irrigation and Power (Shri Hathi): Under the grow more food programme schemes for the construction of wells are entitled to a maximum subsidy of 25 per cent. of the total cost. The amount of subsidy is shared equally between the Centre and the State.

On this basis every year State Governments prepare a programme and carry it out after approval of the Government of India.

FIVE YEAR PLANS OF STATES

***1645. Shri Balwant Sinha Mehta:** (a) Will the Minister of **Planning** be pleased to state whether it is a fact that some State Governments have also prepared their Five Year Plan for their respective States?

(b) If so, how many States have finalised and published their Plans?

(c) Have these plans been prepared in consultation with the Planning Commission?

(d) Was technical expert advice sought for from the Centre in determining the possibilities of their natural resources and location of some basic or important industries in their own States?

The Deputy Minister of Irrigation and Power (Shri Hathi): (a) The Five Year Plans of all State Governments in the country form part of the National Plan which has been prepared by the Planning Commission.

(b) According to information at present available 11 State Governments have so far brought out special publications concerning their State development plans. The plans of all States have been finalised.

(c) Yes.

(d) Technical experts of the Central Ministries participated in the discussions between the Planning Commission and the State Governments when the Plan was being finalised.

FOREIGN MARKETS LOST TO INDIAN TEA

***1646. Shri Jhulan Sinha:** Will the Minister of **Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state:

(a) which of the foreign markets, if any, were lost to the Indian tea during 1952-53; and

(b) the extent of the loss and the grounds therefor?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): (a) and (b). Export of Indian tea to Iran and Ireland showed an appreciable fall during 1952-53. The exports to these countries during the last two years were:—

	1951-52	1952-53
	(1000 lbs.)	
Iran	10,938	882
Ireland	24,105	11,987

The fall in exports to Iran is due to exchange difficulties arising out of the oil dispute in that country. Ireland imported more than its requirements of Indian tea during 1950-51 and 1951-52 and so during 1952-53 these excess imports were being used. Hence the fall in imports during the year.

MATCH INDUSTRY

***1647. Shri K. C. Sodhia:** (a) Will the Minister of **Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state the total amount of excise duty realised during 1952-53 from Match Industry?

(b) What raw materials were imported during 1951-52 and 1952-53 for this industry and what is the total worth thereof?

(c) Were any quantities of matches exported or imported during 1951-52 and 1952-53?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): (a) The provisional figure is Rs. 9·28 crores. The final figures have not yet been compiled.

(b) Phosphorus, Potassium Chlorate, Sulphur, Glue, Starch and Match Paper. Information in regard to the import value of these raw materials consumed by the match industry is not readily available.

(c) Yes, Sir. There were exports as also very small imports.

SURPLUS U.S. ARMY STORES

***1648. Shri H. N. Mukerjee:** (a) Will the Minister of **Works, Housing and Supply** be pleased to state the extent of financial involvement of Government on account of U.S. Army stores brought to India and found surplus on termination of World War II?

(b) To what extent have these stores been utilised by Government?

(c) What is the actual profit and loss account of these stores as at date?

(d) Have the accounts of all depots that are closed, been finalised?

The Deputy Minister of Works, Housing and Supply (Shri Buragohain): (a) and (c). Under the terms of the Indo-U. S. Agreement of 1946, the Government of the United States are entitled to an amount equal to one-half of the sale proceeds of these stores in excess of a sum equivalent to 50 million dollars, to be paid in Rupees, in respect of the sales up to 30th June, 1948. The final balance sheet of the sale of American surpluses has not yet been prepared.

(b) Stores of the sale value of Rs. 12·79 crores (approx.) have been utilised by the Central and State Governments up to the end of February, 1953.

(d) Yes, Sir, except in the case of a few depots closed recently, the accounts of which are in the process of finalisation.

REPORT OF WORLD BANK ENGINEERS

***1649. Shri A. N. Vidyalankar:** Will the Minister of **Irrigation and Power** be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Report of the Party of Engineers of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development that came on an inspection tour has been submitted to and received by Government;

(b) whether a copy of the report will be placed on the Table of the House; and

(c) what their recommendations are?

The Deputy Minister of Irrigation and Power (Shri Hathi): (a) Three engineers of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development visited India and Pakistan last winter to attend the meetings of the Indus Basin Working Party and to accompany the Party on its field trip. The engineers of the Bank were not expected to make a report and none has been received.

(b) and (c). Do not arise.

मांस और मछली का आयात

१२१३. श्री बलवन्त सिंहा महता : क्या वाणिज्य तथा उद्योग मंत्री यह बतलाने की कृपा करेंगे कि भारत में प्रतिवर्ष विदेशों से डिब्बों में बन्द अथवा अन्य प्रकार की मछली मांस तथा इसी प्रकार के अन्य खाद्य पदार्थ कितने मूल्य के और कितनी मात्रा में आयात किये जाते हैं ?

The Minister of Commerce (Shri Karmarkar): A statement giving the information required is laid on the Table of the House. [*See* Appendix X, annexure No. 25.]

TRAINING IN COTTAGE INDUSTRIES

1214. Shri Badshah Gupta: Will the Minister of **Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state:

(a) the names of the various institutions imparting training in various cottage and small scale industries run or aided by the Central Government, situated in the States of Delhi and Uttar Pradesh;

(b) the educational and other qualifications required for admission to the respective institutions; and

(c) the nature of training imparted in the respective institutions?

The Minister of Commerce (Shri Karmarkar): (a) to (c). A statement is laid on the Table of the House. [*Placed in Library. See No. S-42/53.*]

राजस्थान की सीमा पर पाकिस्तानी धावे

१२१५. श्री बलवन्त सिंहा महता : क्या प्रधान मंत्री यह बतलाने की कृपा करेंगे :

(क) राजस्थान की सीमा पर १९५१-५२ और १९५२-५३ में पाकिस्तान की ओर से कितने धावे हुए;

(ख) उन स्थानों के नाम जहां ये धावे मारे गये हैं और

(ग) इन धावों में जान, माल और पशुओं की जिन में भेड़ें आदि भी सम्मिलित हैं, कुल कितनी हानि हुई ?

The Prime Minister (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): (a) The number of raids by Pakistanis on the Rajasthan border is as follows:

1951 ..	122	According to information available for all but six weeks of the year. Complete information has been called for.
1952 ..	158	
1953 ...	30	Till the 15th February.

(b) Raids took place within the limits of the following Police Stations:

1951: *District Ganganagar*:

Kesarsinghpur, Hindumalkote, Ramgarh. Karanpur, Raisinghnagar, Sadar Gangapur.

District Jaisalmer:

Nokh, Sam.

District Barmer: Ramsar.

District Jalore: Bakhasar, Bakhatsar.

1952: Ramgarh, Ganganagar, Sadar Ganganagar, Mohangarh, Bakhasar, Karanpur, Kesrisinghpur, Nokh, Jaisalmer, Padampur, Raisinghnagar, Sindumalkote, Pugal, Anupgarh, Sam, Girab, Chowton, Indragarh, Bhahatra.

1953: (Till the 15th February.) Padampur, Raisinghnagar, Bhakhasar, Sedwa, Hindumalkot, Anupgarh, Kesrisinghpur, Karanpur, Gharsana.

(c) The table below gives the information:

Year	Indian nationals killed	Injured	Kidnapped	Cattle lifted	Estimated lost of propert
					Rs.
1951	10	3	12	702	1,69,564
1952	2	5	14	3272	2,41,593
1953 (Up to 15th February.)	...	1	5	426	23,221

TRAINING IN PRINTING ABROAD

1216. Shri Bahadur Singh: (a) Will the Minister of **Works, Housing and Supply** be pleased to state whether any officials of the Government of India Presses were sent to any foreign countries for training in printing and allied trade during the year 1951-52?

(b) If so, have any of those completed their courses and come back?

The Deputy Minister of Works, Housing and Supply (Shri Buragohain): (a) Yes, Sir, one Assistant Manager of the Government of India Press.

(b) Not yet.

CHAMBAL PROJECT

1217. Shri R. C. Sharma: Will the Minister of **Irrigation and Power** be pleased to state:

(a) the nature of work in progress on the Chambal River Valley Project;

(b) the number of officers, clerks and labourers engaged to work on the project; and

(c) the works completed and the amount of money spent by the Governments of Madhya Bharat and Rajasthan before the project was included in the first Five Year Plan?

The Deputy Minister of Irrigation and Power (Shri Hathi): (a).

Gandhi Sagar Dam.	*Rajasthan.*
Excavation for foundation of the dam is in progress. Crest and regulating shutters to be fixed in the body of the dam is being manufactured by a German Firm. Necessary material for construction is being procured. Tenders are being invited for the supply of generating sets for the Power Station. *Canals*: Final alignment survey of canals and explorations on probable sites for major cross drainage works are in progress. Detailed estimates and designs for canal system are under preparation. Some staff quarters at various places are under construction. *Land acquisition*: Necessary records are being prepared.	Geological investigation of barrage and dam sites and investigations and surveys of alignment of canals from the Kotah Barrage.
(b) Present strength is 21 officer, 94 clerks and about 700 labourers.	1 Executive Engineer, 1 Mechanical Engineer, 4 Assistant Engineers, 37 clerks, 29 subordinate (Technical), 42 Class IV staff and 300 labourers.
(c) (i) 80 permanent buildings, (ii) 22 miles of metalled road from Bhanpura Town to the dam site, (iii) Post, telegraph and telephone system, with trunk facilities, (iv) Geological investigations on the flanks of the river, (v) Designs and estimates of dam and Project report with all details, (vi) Purchase of machinery required and ordering of crest and sluice gates; and (vii) Aerial survey of commanded area and final alignment survey of 85 miles of canals.	(i) Rawatbhatta Housing Colony. (ii) Kotah-Rawatbhatta Road. (9 miles still to be completed).
Rs. 1·30 crores upto the end of December, 1952.	Rs. 37·94 lakhs upto the end of December, 1952.

TRADE DEPOTS IN N.E.F. AGENCY

1218. Shri Rishang Keishing: Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state:

(a) the number of trade depots established in the interior of the North East Frontier Agency to facilitate supply of essential articles to the people at reasonable price;

(b) the names of the essential articles and the approximate cash value of the same kept annually in each of the depots; and

(c) how far the needs and demands of the people for essential articles are met by this arrangement?

The Prime Minister (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): (a) Three.

(b) A statement giving the names of the sixteen articles kept at the Depots is placed on the Table. [*See* Appendix X, annexure No. 26]

The annual approximate cash value is as follows:—

Kimin:	..	Rs. 5,000.
Sagalle:	..	Rs. 10,000.
Ziro:	..	Rs. 15,000.

(c) The essential articles mentioned in para. (b) above were supplied to the hill people at rates lower than those prevailing in the plains market as the Trade Depots are run on a "no-profit" basis. The majority of the essential articles were supplied and the demands of the tribal people of the neighbouring areas were fulfilled. Elsewhere there are ordinary private shops which meet the needs of the people.

The tribal people are encouraged to run their own 'economy' shops which have been opened in some places.

MEDICAL FACILITIES IN N.E.F. AGENCY

1219. Shri Gohain: (a) Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state the number of hospitals, dispensaries and health units which are already in existence in the N.E.F. Agency?

(b) How many more hospitals, dispensaries and health units will be established by 1955-56?

(c) What amount will be spent on this scheme?

The Prime Minister (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): (a) 5 hospitals, 41 dispensaries including 3 ayurvedic dispensaries and 16 Mobile Health Units are at present in existence in the North-East Frontier Agency.

(b) Under the Five Year Plan, 8 hospitals, including 2 Base hospitals, 22 dispensaries and 6 Mobile Health Units are proposed to be established during the 3 years period, *i.e.*, from 1953-54 to 1955-56.

(c) An amount of Rs. 65 lakhs is proposed to be spent during the 5 year period (1951-56) for the implementation of the schemes under the Development Plan. This includes the expenses for training of 25 doctors, 25 compounders and 15 midwives from among the tribal people, a leprosy colony in addition to the 3 already established, an anti-Malaria and an anti-V. D. Unit.

SALT ALLOTMENT TO BIHAR

1220. Shri Jhulan Sinha: Will the Minister of Production be pleased to state:

(a) the quota of different varieties of salt allotted to the State of Bihar during 1951-52 and 1952-53;

(b) the extent to which these quotas were lifted during 1951-52 and 1952-53; and

(c) whether the salt requirements of Bihar have been fully met by the quota allotted thereto?

The Minister of Production (Shri K. C. Reddy): (a) and (b). A statement showing the quota of different varieties of salt allotted to Bihar and the quantity lifted during 1951-52 and 1952-53 is laid on the Table of the House. [*See* Appendix X, annexure No. 27.]

(c) During 1951-52, 94 per cent. of the total requirements of the State were met, and in 1952-53 the total lifting was in excess of the quota, having been 115 per cent.

FOREIGN PASSPORTS FOR PERSONS IN TRIPURA

1221. Shri Dasaratha Deb: Will the Prime Minister be pleased to state how many persons from Tripura applied for foreign passports i.e. exculding those for Pakistan in 1952-53 and how many of them have been refused the same?

The Prime Minister (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): During the year 1952-53, six persons from Tripura applied for international passports. Of these, four were granted passports, one was refused and one application is still pending.

AUTOMOBILE ASSEMBLING INDUSTRY

1222. Shri A. N. Vidyalankar: Will the Minister of Commerce and Industry be pleased to state:

(a) the amount of Indian and foreign capital invested in automobile assembling industry in India;

(b) the quantity of goods manufactured by these plants that have been purchased by the Central and State Governments; and

(c) the number of Indian employees in these manufacturing concerns who get a salary of more than Rs. 500 and the number of similarly paid foreign employees in India?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): (a) Approximately Rs. 10 crores and Rs. 1 crore respectively.

(b) Information regarding quantity is not available. Value of orders placed by the Governments for motor vehicles and parts (excluding tyres and tubes) during 1951-52 was however Rs. 78·66 lakhs and during April 1952 to January 1953, 35·92 lakhs.

(c) 244 and 99 respectively as on 1st January 1952. These figures relate to 10 firms out of a total of 12. Information about the other two firms is not available.

Dated..........[illegible]

THE
PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES
(Part II—Proceedings other than Questions and Answers)
OFFICIAL REPORT

HOUSE OF THE PEOPLE

Monday, 27th April, 1953

The House met at a Quarter Past Eight of the Clock.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

(*See Part I*)

9-15 A.M.

PANEL OF CHAIRMEN

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have to inform the House that under sub-rule (1) of Rule 8 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business, the hon. Speaker has nominated the following Members on the Panel of Chairmen in place of the Members nominated earlier by him on the Panel:

1. Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava.
2. Shrimati Ammu Swaminadhan.
3. Shri Hari Vinayak Pataskar.
4. Sardar Hukam Singh.
5. Shrimati Renu Chakravartty.
6. Shrimati B. Khongmen.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE.

REPORT OF EXPERT COMMITTEE (EXCISE)

The Minister of Finance (Shri C. D. Deshmukh): I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Report of the Expert Committee (Excise), promised in reply to the supplementary to Starred Question No. 1870. asked on the 18th July, 1952. [*Placed in Library. See* No. IV. P.O. (25).]

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy (Mysore): What about the Adjournment Motion?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have already sent my remarks on the Adjournment Motion.

Shri Sarangadhar Das (Dhenkanal—West Cuttack): May I make a submission?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I know. Hon. Members should know that whenever an Adjournment Motion is tabled, it has to receive the consent of the Speaker, and if consent is not given and orders are communicated, and if they want to make any further representation, I will weigh it, and if I revise my decision, I will bring it up the next day. Therefore, hon. Members who have got any difficulty or suggestions to make may kindly see me later.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta North-East): May I make a submission? I find on the Order Paper that the Repealing and Amending Bill, 1953 is being taken up today, if there is time for it. The difficulty is that this Bill refers to so many previous enactments, and wants to make certain alterations.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Is it first in the list?

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: No.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Then, I will consider it when we come to it later.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: We would like to be more or less reassured that it will not be reached today.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: When does the hon. Member suggest that it may be taken up? After all, he will find that it is only a formal affair.

Shri K. K. Basu (Diamond Harbour): Without reading the parent Act, you cannot follow. No extracts are given here.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I would suggest to Mr. Mukerjee that I will look into this matter, and it will not be too late if this matter is taken up tomorrow.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: The point is we want some little information.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We will do so. I will give ample opportunity to all.

Would the Finance Minister like to take up his motion earlier?

The Minister of Finance (Shri C. D. Deshmukh): I would rather Shri Alagesan takes it up first. There are one or two matters I have got to attend to.

INDIAN MERCHANT SHIPPING (AMENDMENT) BILL

The Deputy-Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Alagesan): I beg to move:

> "That the Bill to enable effect to be given to an International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea, signed in London on the tenth day of June, nineteen hundred and forty-eight, to amend the provisions of the Indian Merchant Shipping Act, 1923 relating to life-saving appliances, wireless and radio navigational aids and to other matters affected by the said Convention, be taken into consideration."

As indicated in the title, and as explained in the Statement of Objects and Reasons the primary object of the Bill is to effect such amendments in the Indian Merchant Shipping Act, 1923, as are necessary to give effect to the International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea, 1948. The subject matter of the Bill is highly technical and essentially of a non-controversial nature. I shall try to give the back-ground for this Bill and explain some of the salient features of the Safety Convention, 1948, in the language of the lay person.

At present, important matters relating to safety of ships and of those on board are governed by the International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea, 1929. This Convention deals with the construction of ships, life-saving appliances and wireless equipment to be carried by them, safety of navigation and issue of Convention certificates of international validity.

This Convention was ratified by practically all the maritime countries including India. This Convention was given effect to by India by amending the Indian Merchant Shipping Act in the year 1933. After the conclusion of the last world war, the United Kingdom Government called a conference to review the 1929 Convention in the light of further experience gained, particularly during the last war, and the scientific progress made since the coming into force of the 1929 Convention. The Conference was held in London between the 23rd April and 10th June, 1948, and was attended by representatives from 30 States including India and the other Commonwealth countries. The new Convention, which was adopted by the conference, came into force on the 19th November, 1952. The Government of India have also ratified the new Convention along with 18 other countries and it applies to India from that date.

Since India achieved her independence, there has been considerable development in Indian shipping and our sea-going tonnage now stands at more than 4,00,000 G.R.T. as compared to only about 1,50,000 in 1946. Indian ships are now regularly plying on international trades and ships of practically all the important maritime countries of the world call at Indian ports. It is, therefore, not only desirable but also necessary, that Indian Merchant ships should be maintained, in regard to safety, at internationally accepted standards. The Indian National Steamship Owners' Association, which is the representative body of Indian Shipping companies, has been consulted and they are of the view that India should subscribe to the new Convention. For this reason, as well as the reason that Indian ships will not be subjected to control at foreign ports, and to ensure that Indian Certificates secure international recognition, it has been decided by the Government of India to ratify the 1948 Convention.

✓ Now, I should like to take the time of the House a little and indicate the salient features of the new Convention, i.e., the 1948 Convention and how it compares with the old Convention, i.e. the 1929 Convention. The new Convention broadly deals with the same subjects as were dealt with in the old Convention, but it is wider in scope and represents an advance over the old Convention. As in the case of the old Convention, the new Convention applies to ships engaged on international voyages, i.e. voyages from a port in a country to which the Convention applies to a port outside that country and *vice versa*. The new Convention consists of 15 Articles and a number of Regulations are annexed to it which form an integral part of it. These Regulations are divided into six Chapters.

Chapter I contains General Provisions relating to Surveys and Issue of Certificates. Whereas the 1929 Convention applied to all passenger ships and cargo ships of 1,600 tons and above, the 1948 Convention applies to all passenger ships and cargo ships of 500 tons and above. Again, as regards these cargo ships, the 1948 Convention provides for the issue of a new Convention Certificate called Safety Equipment Certificate, and the cargo ships also are obliged to carry life-saving appliances which was not the case before.

Chapter II deals with construction of passenger ships and provides for certain standards for compartmentation of ships with a view to their retaining reserve buoyancy, if damaged. It also contains provisions for the fire protection in accommodation and service spaces and for the carriage of fire detection and extinction apparatus in passenger as well as cargo ships. It introduces stability regulations to ensure that a vessel shall be able to withstand the listing effects of damage. These provisions did not apply to cargo ships before. Another new feature of the 1948 Convention is that every new ship is required to carry on board such information in writing about the ship's stability as is necessary for the guidance of the Master in efficient handling of the ship.

Chapter III prescribes life-saving appliances and for the first time these provisions have been made applicable to cargo ships. Chapter IV deals with provisions regarding Radio telegraphy and Radio telephony and the nature of watches to be maintained on ships. The term 'Radio' has been uniformly used, whereas previously both the terms, 'wireless' and 'radio', were used. One new feature is that cargo ships of 500 tons and above but less than 1,600 tons, are now required to carry either Radio telegraphy or Radio telephony at the option of the owners. Chapter V deals with general safety of navigation and provides for communication of dangers to navigation and for the issue of distress messages. Whereas passenger ships of 5,000 tons and above only were required to be provided with a direction finding apparatus previously, now all ships, passenger and cargo, of 1,600 tons and above are obliged to be fitted with it. The last chapter, *i.e.*, Chapter VI provides for the international regulation of the carriage of grain in bulk and to ensure that proper and reasonable precautions are taken to prevent the grain from shifting; similar provisions are also made for the carriage of dangerous goods and governments are authorised to issue Regulations governing their carriage.

There is one particular matter which is of special interest to India. The new Convention like the existing one has realised that it will be impracticable to enforce full compliance with the Convention requirements relating to construction and life-saving appliance in the case of passenger ships employed in the carriage of large number of unberthed passengers in special trades which include Indian deck passenger and pilgrim traffic. The Convention has, therefore, repeated the Articles providing for exemption of this class of ships from the full requirements of the Convention subject to certain conditions. One of the conditions is that steps shall be taken to formulate general rules in concert with the other Contracting Government directly interested in these trades. At present, the Indian deck passenger and pilgrim traffic trades are regulated by what is known as the Simla rules, 1931, which constitute an international agreement arrived at among countries interested in the unberthed passenger traffic. These rules were formulated at a Conference convened in Simla in 1931 in pursuance of the 1929 Convention and prescribe lower standards of construction and life-saving appliances in relation to ships carrying unberthed passengers. The Deck Passenger Committee, which was appointed by the Government in 1950 to examine the general question of improving the conditions of deck travel and safety standards in unberthed passenger ships, has suggested certain modifications to the Simla rules. India has agreed to take the initiative in convening the proposed conference and further necessary action in this matter is intended to be taken up as soon as possible now that the 1948 Convention has been ratified and has come into force.

As already stated, the object of the present Bill is to enable the Government of India to implement the relevent provisions of the Convention which was signed by the Indian delegation on the 10th June, 1948. The Bill proposes minimum amendments to the Indian Merchant Shipping Act, 1923, conferring powers on Government to enforce the provisions of the Convention. The provisions of the

[Shri **Alagesan.**]

Bill generally apply to Indian ships and to foreign ships when in Indian waters. The subject matter is so technical that detailed arrangements have to be relegated to rules. The Bill provides for the rule-making powers and our technical officers are already preparing the necessary rules. In some respects, the powers sought go somewhat beyond those strictly required to implement the Convention, so as to enable the Government to apply the Convention standards to ships plying on our coastal trade wherever possible. For instance, although the provisions of the Convention relating to Life Saving Appliances apply for the first time to cargo ships, Indian coasting ships have always been required to carry Life Saving Appliances under the Indian Merchant Shipping Act, 1923. It is, however, the intention when making the rules, to provide for lower standards, or for exemption from, or relaxation of, the Convention requirements consistent with the safety of ships, to avoid undue hardship to the operators of coastal ships.

I am afraid I have been boring the House with technical information. It cannot altogether be avoided in explaining the provisions of a Bill of this nature. Many of the clauses of the Bill are consequential to the ones introduced in conformity with the new Convention. By subscribing to this Convention which can be called a Charter for the Safety of Life and Property at Sea, we shall enable India to take her rightful place among the great maritime countries of the World. Though I called the Bill non-controversial at the beginning of my speech, this does not take away from the importance of it. I have every confidence that the House will accept the Bill.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion moved:

> "That the Bill to enable effect to be given to an International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea, signed in London on the tenth day of June, nineteen hundred and forty-eight, to amend the provisions of the Indian Merchant Shipping Act, 1923 relating to life-saving appliances, wireless and radio navigational aids and to other matters affected by the said Convention, be taken into consideration."

Shri Nambiar (Mayuram): I have to state at the outset that due to the short notice given, we could not prepare in full the points which we wanted to present in this case, because there was dislocation in the programme. That is my first difficulty.

Coming to the Bill, I say that we must follow this Convention which is intended to ensure safety of life at sea. And I would add that a comprehensive Bill should be brought forward, which will look into the needs of the whole industry as such including those of the workers employed in that industry. We know that about a lakh of workers is employed in this shipping industry today. But unfortunately the shipping industry in India is very weak compared with those of the other maritime countries of the world. We are still at the infant stage, and are called upon to compete with the foreign countries which are far advanced in the shipping industry.

Now, while promoting these new appliances and new methods, and while looking to the needs of the travellers, we must also see to the needs of the workers as well in the industry as a whole. For instance, the Seattle Convention had recommended many improvements on the conditions of the workers, such as wage increase, provision for overtime work, an improvement in the hours of working etc. But none of these questions has been taken up by the Government of India. They have taken up only the latest Safety Convention and want to bring in legislation to cover that aspect only, disregarding the original promise of a comprehensive Bill covering all aspects of the industry. When we are looking to the needs of the persons who are seamen, we must also look to the needs of the workers who are employed in this industry. It will be surprising to know that the *sekhanis* and other workers in the shipping industry are working for 84 hours a week. It might be said that this is all beyond the scope of the Bill...

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member knows too well that this is all beyond the scope of the Bill. I allowed general remarks to the effect that the other portion relating to the conditions of service of the workmen ought to be taken on hand, and the hon. Member regrets that that has not been included, and a comprehensive Bill has not been brought forward. But to go further into the details of those things will be absolutely beyond the scope of the Bill.

Shri Nambiar: I was submitting this so that I may present to the House the present position and show how it requires a modification.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: But we are not going into the details of the other Convention. The remark on the improvement of the general conditions of the workers etc. is an important suggestion that was made in that Convention. So far, it was all right.

Shri Nambiar: But my point is the Government of India are accepting this Convention, and not the Seattle Convention which relates to workers.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We ought not to go into the details of the other Convention which is not before us.

Shri Nambiar: What I want to submit and drive home to the hon. Minister is that the condition of the workers is so horrible that they are working for about 84 hours a week, and so there is the need to bring in a legislation restricting their working hours to 44 hours a week, instead of 84 hours, and there are many other such aspects, into which I do not want to go now.

I would like to point out another thing with regard to the aplication of this Bill. The 1948 Convention for the safety of life at sea defines international voyage as.

> "a voyage from a country to which the present Convention applies to a port outside such country, or conversely".

That means a voyage from any port from India to any port outside India. Now in the case of a voyage from Karachi to Chittagong, which is a voyage from one port of Pakistan to another port of Pakistan, no safety appliances are required. But if the voyage is from Chittagong to Calcutta, then this Convention applies. What I am saying is this. I am for all sorts of safety measures, whether it is with regard to coastal shipping or between short distances or long distances. I want to see that the Indian shipping industry which is now in an infant state should develop. But in the case of ships plying between short distances, there should not be the hard application of these rules which will tell upon the industry as it is today. Therefore, what I want to point out is that these rules should not be literally applied to ships plying between port which are near each other. That is why I have quoted the instance of Chittagong as well as Calcutta. Whereas Chittagong and Karachi are considered to be places inside the same country and they do not require the application of these rules, it looks ridiculous that a voyage between Chittagong and Calcutta will not come under the same category and will be considered to be an international voyage, meaning thereby that all these rules are to be strictly applied. Therefore, there are certain anomalies—lacunae—in the application of these rules. The Govenmrent should see that such lancunae are done away with and also see that the Indian shipping industry, which is in an infant stage, is helped and not teased in this way. But the Bill as it comes today will certainly injure the Indian shipping industry.

Another point I want to drive home is the treatment our Indian national shipping industry gets as compared with foreign shipping industries. We know that still there is that flag discrimination. This has been repeatedly pointed out by the Indian shipping industrialists. This discrimination means that they do not get proper berthing and other facilities when they go abroad whereas we give to the foreign ships which come to Indian ports all such facilities. This discrimination is continuing and the Indian shipping industrialists have repeatedly protested against this. But the Government do not take care of that. The Government, on the other hand, give all possible facilities to these foreign ships which come to Indian ports; whereas the Indian ships which go to the foreign ports are not given that proper consideration—particularly by United Kingdom and such other big countries. This point must also be considered by the Government and they must see that the Indian shipping industry is helped. Otherwise, by the application of these rules strictly, without looking into the needs of the shipping industry as a whole and without looking into the needs of the seamen as a whole in India we are not going to advance the cause of the industry nor of the workers. That is my contention.

Recently, you might have heard, Sir, in Calcutta they wanted to enforce a 'medical certificate' for every voyage that is to be undertaken by a seaman. There was a big strike in connection with that. It is true that the Government have temporarily relaxed this condition; but they have not yet restored the condition which was prevailing earlier. They said that the Seattle Convention recommended this medical examination. Disregarding all other aspects of the recommendations of the Seattle Convention, they have picked up only this particularly recommendation, so that they can use it against the seamen in Calcutta. That was the position. This situation also requires reconsideration.

Then, there is the question of visa,

[Shri Nambiar]

visa for seamen. For instance, the seamen are asked to bring in with their visa a C.D.C. certificate. And there is a long queue in the Calcutta port. It is said that certain persons who have got a place in the queue in advance are offered a bribe of Rs. 2/- so that they get away from the line. These things are going on in Calcutta today. The Government keep their eyes shut to these facts.

These are the practical difficulties and grievances of the seamen as well as the industry as a whole, and the Government must come forward with a comprehensive legislation which alone will satisfy all the interests concerned; otherwise this sort of piece meal legislation will not serve the purpose. This is all what I have to say.

Shri Damodara Menon (Kozhikode): I think this measure is something which must be supported by everybody because it brings our shipping in tune with international convention. I agree with Mr. Nambiar that we have not yet had sufficient time to study the full scope of this Bill. But as I was hearing the hon. Minister and going through some of the provisions contained in the Bill, I found section 28 which gives exemptions from the application of this Bill. I want the hon. Minister to explain why fishing vessels are exempt from the provisions of this Bill. It would be a bad thing if we do not take particular care to see that, as far as possible, every vessel that goes out into the sea is provided with a safety certificate and safety equipment which are in keeping with international convention. Now, there are big ocean-going steamships which confine their attention to fishing. Why should we exempt them from the application of the safety provisions contained in this Bill, which are in keeping with international convention? I can quite appreciate that countrycrafts are exempt from this provisions. But even there, I would like the hon. Minister to explain what safety provisions are now applied. We know that especially on the West coast we construct many countrycrafts and much of the trade is also carried on in countrycrafts. Some of these countrycrafts go to foreign ports also. I know that these countrycrafts from the Malabar coast, during fair weather seasons, go as far as Arabian ports. So I want to know what safety provision we have in regard to these countrycrafts.

Another point which my hon. friend, Mr. Nambiar, touched is regarding seamen—their conditions of service and all those things. Strictly, that does not come within the scope of this Bill, but I would like the hon. Minister to tell the House what steps Government propose to take to see that the conditions of service of these seamen are properly maintained. I know, in regard to the recruitment of seamen also much remains to be improved. We have in India many of our own ships which employ a number of foreigners as seamen. I want the hon. Minister to give me an idea of the number of foreigners who are employed as seamen in our vessels and what steps Government are going to take to see that only Indian nationals are employed as seamen in our own vessels at least.

Now, regarding recruitment, the persons who generally go to these vessels as seamen and who have also a natural inclination for the sea come from Cochin and the Malabar coast. The people there are sea-faring by nature. I find there is no recruitment centre for seamen in that coast and they have mostly to go either to Calcutta or to Bombay or Visakhapatnam to get themselves recruited. I want the hon. Minister to go into this question and see that the people of Malabar and also Travancore-Cochin, who are sea-faring by nature, are given ample opportunities to get themselves recruited as seamen. I would even request the hon. Minister to have a recruiting centre started at Cochin and, if possible, also a training centre, though that point does not come strictly within the scope of this Bill. I hope the hon. Minister will enlighten the House on these matters also.

Shri Alagesan: I am grateful to the two hon. Members who have made valuable suggestions. Mr. Nambiar was talking of workers' conditions and you correctly ruled, Sir, that that was beside the scope of the present Bill. But, that does not mean that Government is not solicitous about the conditions of workers.

Mr. Nambiar was referring to some of the provisions of the Convention which is called the Seattle Convention because the Convention was made at a place called Seattle. So far as the shipping in the private sector is concerned, it is a question of adjustment and negotiation between the employers and the seamen and the Government is prepared to do everything in its power to see that workers get their due.

Then, he was referring to voyages undertaken between Karachi and Chittagong and Calcutta and Chittagong. It is known, that Karachi and Chittagong are within Pakistan. So, since Pakistan itself has accepted the Convention, we shall hope that they will do something to implement this Convention.

As I have said in my speech, as regards the provision of these safety appliances etc, we have insisted that even coastal ships should carry these appliances. It is true that we do not want to over-burden the coastal ships with all these things and that is why a relaxation is provided. Even so, we have been insisting on some at lease of these provisions being observed by ships engaged in coastal trade. Our shipping industry is a very young one and we do not like to over-burden it. They will be given ample time to make adjustments to the new Convention and it will not be impossed suddenly on them.

Then my friend talked about flag discrimination. As far as Indian ships are concerned, there is no flag discrimination in foreign ports, as regards port, berthing and other facilities. In fact, it is such a delicate question that it recoils on us if we talk too much of this flag discrimination. In fact, our ship-owners and shipping industry are interested in seeing that this theory of flag discrimination does not work against our interests. When government try to help Indian shipping there is always a fear that the other countries may come upon us and tell us that we are discriminating against them. Some of the powerful maritime countries who have got very large and well-established mercantile fleets have sponsored this theory of flag discrimination and, without knowing the full consequences, some in India have also taken it up. It is not a question of our being discriminated against but it is a question of misrepresenting or mis-interpreting aid which we would like to give to our own shipping industry as discrimination against foreign shipping. We have to guard against that. I can assure the hon. Member that as regards port and berthing facilities, there is no discrimination against Indian shipping in foreign ports and the ship-owners have not made any complaint with regard to that.

My hon. friend, Mr. Damodara Menon talked of country craft and wanted to know why fishing vessels are exempted from this. They are less than 500 tons and they do not carry passengers, and they have been exempted. The Sailing Vessels Committee has recommended what should be done with regard to safety of these country craft. The Officer who was Chairman of that Committee has been put in special charge and he is now looking into the various improvements that he himself has suggested as Chairman of the Committee.

My friend pleaded for recruitment of seamen from Travancore-Cochin State. Now, there are two establishments, one at Visakhapatnam and another at Calcutta for the training of these ratings. In the training establishment at Visakhapatnam the recruits from Madras, Travancore-Cochin and Bombay are taken and in the Calcutta establishment—now of course it is mostly for displaced persons—recruits from other States are taken. There is a proposal to have another establishment in Saurashtra and when that establishment is created, then perhaps there will be greater chance of taking more people from some of the Southern States like Travancore-Cochin etc. in the Visakhapatnam establishment.

Shri Damodara Menon: Nothing in Travancore-Cochin?

Shri Alagesan: There is no proposal to start one in Travancore-Cochin. It is our idea that with these three establishments we will be able to recruit the number required, namely about 2,000 a year. But, as I said, when the establishment in Saurashtra is put on its feet, then there will be greater chances for recruitment from some of the Southern States like Travancore-Cochin. I think, I have covered the points raised by the two hon. Members and I commend my motion to the House.

Shri Nambiar: I should like to have one clarification, Sir. Is it not a fact that the Chairman of the Sea Transport Committee of the International Chambers of Commerce, which held its conference at Paris recently broadcast through the radio a speech entitled the "Indian Shipping Industry", which aroused so much of feeling in Indian industry? The hon. Minister said that with regard to flag discrimination it was not brought to his notice that such discrimination is there. Here, in their own magazine *Indian shipping* published by the Indian National Steamship Owners'

[Shri Nambiar]

Association, it is very clearly stated that there was so much discontent due to this. The broadcast of Sir Anderson who was President of this Conference has created so much discontent. Is the hon. Minister aware of it and has he done anything with regard to that.

Shri Alagesan: I do not have the details relating to particular speeches or broadcasts and the reactions that have been created in India. I should like to have time. I can assure him that I will go into it.

Babu Ramnarayan Singh (Hazaribagh West): May I know one thing; how seamen are recruited and whether there are centres in the States for their recruitment?

Shri Alagesan: There are no centres in the States for recruitment; they have been mostly recruited at Bombay and Calcutta and a smaller number at Madras also. I referred to the training establishments at Calcutta and Visakhapatnam.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There are two training centres and the recruitment is done at the ports. The question is.

> "That the Bill to enable effect to be given to an International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea, signed in London on the tenth day of June, nineteen hundred and forty-eight, to amend the provisions of the Indian Merchant Shipping Act, 1923 relating to life-saving appliances, wireless and radio navigational aids and to other matters affected by the said Convention be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We shall now take up the clauses. I find that there are no amendments from clauses 1 to 30.

Clauses 1 to 30 were added to the Bill.

Clause 31.— (*Transitional provisions*)

Shri Alagesan: I may explain that the convention has been accepted by nineteen maritime countries, and it has come into force from the 19th November, 1952. Since we could not pass this Bill before that date, we want to have this amendment made.

Amendment made:

> "In page 11, lines 16 and 17, *for* "the date of the commencement of this Act" *substitute* "the 19th day of November, 1952".
>
> —[*Shri Alagesan*]

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

> "That clause 31, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 31, as amended, was added to the Bill

The Title and the Enacting Formula were added to the Bill.

Shri Alagesan: I beg to move:

> "That the Bill, as amended, be passed."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion moved:

> "That the Bill, as amended, be passed."

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta North-East): I had no intention of intervening in this debate, but certain points have been raised in the course of it which made me feel that perhaps at this last stage of the passage of this Bill we might have further elucidation on those particular matters.

First of all, I want to refer to the sort of assurance given by the hon. Deputy Minister that Government does bear in mind the idea of bringing another piece of legislation which would bear upon the living conditions of those who work in our shipping industry. In regard to that, I wish Government were a little more specific, because we feel that the condition of seamen, particularly in the part of the country which I happen to represent, is giving cause for considerable anxiety. I know, of course that Government have recently taken certain measures in regard to the comparative relaxation of certain rigid standards of medical examination, which have been welcomed in Calcutta. But I know that there are certain other very serious grievances which remain to be remedied.

Reference has been made to the Seattle Convention. In regard to that, the standing complaint of labour is that while medical examination standards are sought to be heightened with reference to that Convention, other provisions which related to the amenities of seamen have not been really taken into consideration. But I am happy that Government have given a sort of assurance that these things have not escaped their attention and that certain measures are likely to be introduced in not very distant future.

I also intervened in this debate because a certain reference was made by my hon. friend, Mr. Damodara Menon, to non-Indian nationals who happen to be forming a very important proportion of workers in the shipping industry. I did not hear the Deputy Minister give any specific answer in relation to that point, but I want to say that perhaps while we are certainly entitled to expect that Indian nationals ought to man our ships as far as that is practicable, at the same time we ought to realise that at the present moment, on account of certain important objective historical conditions, Pakistani nationals form a large proportion of our seamen. In Calcutta Port, for example, more than 80 per cent. of the seamen come from Pakistan. These common working people from Pakistan come to Calcutta, as they have been coming there for generations, as a matter of course so to speak. To them, the bifurcation of India into Pakistan and India is really an artificial operation. They come to India in the natural course, as they have been doing for so many years, and there is not the slightest idea in their mind that as far as their work as seamen is concerned, they are non-Indian nationals. In the present posture of Indo-Pakistan relations, we ought to remember this salutary condition of things.

As far as the seamen of the Calcutta region are concerned, they come mostly from East Pakistan, and I can assure the House that they come here in order to earn their bread, having no ideas about belonging to another country, which is a foreign country. This whole recent phenomenon of the division of our country is something which has taken them by surprise, so to speak, and if we now take any step which would disturb their normal expectations of employment, surely that is going to be not only a very undesirable step from the human point of view, but also an undesirable step from the point of view of the relations between India and Pakistan.

10 A.M.

I know that every encouragement ought to be given to the recruitment of Indian nationals as seamen, but at the same time we have these Pakistani seamen coming to our country just in order to earn their bread. Besides, they have accumulated through generations of experience a kind of skill in seamanship which is almost unequalled. I think that they hold the record in the world as far as cheapness combined with efficiency is concerned. These people have, therefore, to be reassured.

At the present moment, there is some difficulty over their passports and visas. They have a certain certificate called the C.D.C. which is usually acknowledged by international practice as being tantamount to a passport or visa, but I am told that there have been many representations regarding the difficulties they are experiencing when they have to come to India after having gone home, having completed their tenure of service on a particular ship. I want to draw the attention of Government to the inconvenience which has lately been caused by the delay in the grant of visas to these Pakistani seamen who want to come to Calcutta as a matter of course in order to earn their living. On these Pakistani seamen, the efficient conduct of our shipping industry very largely depends. These Pakistani seamen have really no idea in regard to the political and other involvements of the division of our country. In their mind, I am sure, the division of India is not really a fact, and therefore we should, while trying to recruit as many Indian nationals as possible as seamen, do nothing which would increase the apprehension in the minds of these very experienced Pakistani seamen. Their work has been unexceptionable so far, and that is why I wish Government, first of all, to reiterate the assurance that they gave to the effect that they are going to do something about the living conditions of seamen in our shipping industry, and in the second place, to assure us that nothing is going to be done which will disturb the good feeling which exists as far as the Pakistani seamen working in Indian ports are concerned. I also wish Government to assure us that their difficulties, specially in regard to medical examination and grant of passports, would be sympathetically considered.

Shri Nambiar: I want to obtain some clarification from the Deputy Minister. Can we expect a comprehensive legislation with regard to the service and working conditions of seamen, specially about the hours of work? Will the hours of work be limited to 44 hours? Is there any measure under the contemplation of Government? Are they considering this point at all, or not at all considering it? If they are considering it, will any measure be brought within a very short time? These are the points on which I want some clarification.

Shri Alagesan: I can straightway tell the House that we propose to bring a comprehensive legislation. I can also tell the House that it will include some of the provisions that find a place in the Seattle Convention. At this stage, I am unable to say to what extent we would be able to go,

[**Shri Alagesan.**]

but there will be ample time for hon. Members to scrutinise the measure when it is placed before the House, and it can be passed to the satisfaction of all concerned.

As regards the point raised by my hon. friend, Mr. H. N. Mukerjee, it is a sort of contradictory approach. He wants that there should not be any delay in recruiting Indian nationals to serve in our ships. At the same time, he does not want any dislocation to be caused to the Pakistani seamen. It is rather difficult to adjust these two things; he is trying to go slow and fast, if I may say so, in this matter. In fact, anxiety was expressed that we should try and recruit almost the entire seamen from Indian nationals and see that the seamen who are employed in our ships are cent. percent. Indian nationals. At present, it is true that a large percentage of the seamen come from, technically, a foreign country, *viz.*, Pakistan. They also come from Goa, which is in Portuguese India. We are anxious to increase the percentage of Indian nationals working in the ships and towards that end we are issuing what are called C.D.Cs —continuous discharge certificates to recruits, so that they can be taken back. Also New C.D.Cs are being issued to a large number of ex-naval ratings who served in the Navy during the war and have since been demobilised.

I have already referred to the Rating Training Schemes at Calcutta and at Visakhapatnam. Up till now we have turned out about 1,982 trainees from these two establishments. We propose to have another establishment also and soon we may be able to turn out about 2,000 trainees every year. They will gradually replace the foreign nationals who are now working in our ships.

As regards difficulties about visas, I am given to understand that no such difficulties exist and we do not want to place any unnecessary restrictions in the way of Pakistanis who are now employed in our ships.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That the Bill, as amended, be passed."

The motion was adopted.

SALARIES AND ALLOWANCES OF OFFICERS OF PARLIAMENT BILL.

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): I beg to move.*

"That the Bill to provide for the salaries and allowances of certain Officers of Parliament, be taken into consideration."

The Bill follows the pattern of an Act that has been passed by this House and the other one, namely the Salaries and Allowances of Ministers Act of 1952. The position is that under Article 97 of the Constitution the salaries and allowances of the Speaker and the Deputy Speaker of the House of the People and the Chairman and the Deputy Chairman of the Council of States may be fixed by Parliament by law, and until provision in that behalf is so made, such salaries and allowances as are specified in the Second Schedule shall be paid to them. The appropriate portion of the Second Schedule (Part C) says:

> "There shall be paid to the Speaker of the House of the People and the Chairman of the Council of States such salaries and allowances as were payable to the Speaker of the Constituent Assembly of the Dominion of India immediately before the commencement of this Constitution, and there shall be paid to the Deputy Speaker of the House of the People and the Deputy Chairman of the Council of States such salaries and allowances as were payable to the Deputy Speaker of the Constituent Assembly of the Dominion of India immediately before such commencement."

Under these provisions, the salaries and allowances of the Speaker and the Deputy Speaker, the Chairman and the Deputy Chairman were fixed by an order of the President. The salary of the Speaker was fixed at Rs. 3,000 per mensem, with sumptuary allowance of Rs. 500, with a fully furnished residence free of rent. Similar facility was also given to the Chairman of the Council of States. In regard to the position of the Deputy Speaker and the Deputy Chairman, the provisions varied, naturally, as under the previous arrangement a salary of Rs. 1,500 was paid per month to the Deputy-Speaker and the Deputy Chairman plus the daily allowance that they were drawing, but they had no other amenities.

The present intention is outlined in the Bill. I might also add that when the salaries of Ministers were brought down from Rs. 3,000 to Rs. 2,250, both the Speaker of the House of the People and the Chairman of the Council of States made a voluntary cut in their salary, equal to the amount that was reduced in the salaries of Ministers. The position envisaged by the Bill now before the House is that the salaries of the Speaker and the Chairman of the Council of States should be equated to the salaries of the Ministers and the amenities that are provided for them by way of a fully furnished residence free of rent and a sumptuary allowance, as is being given to the Cabinet Ministers, shall be paid to them. In regard to the Deputy-Speaker and the Deputy Chairman, the position now is that they shall be paid a salary of Rs. 2,000 per month plus the facilities in regard to residence, similar to what is given to Minsters and Deputy Ministers as well as the Speaker and the Chairman of the Council of States. But they will not be entitled to the sumptuary allowance. The other facilities, like travelling allowance, medical facilities, advance for purchase of cars, etc., follow the pattern of the Salaries and Allowances of Ministers Act of 1952.

---

*Moved with the recommendation of the President.

The Bill does not require any further elucidation from me, as the position is fairly clear. Hon. Members are fully familiar with the conditions that were obtaining before and what is obtaining today. I see certain amendments have been tabled. I suppose the amendments are permitted by you on my agreeing to accept them. I do not think I will be in a position to accept them. But I do not want any technicalities to stand in the way of the amendments being moved. One amendment, moved by my hon. friend Mr. Punnoose is, in my view, out of order. The hon. Member suggests that the Speaker and the Deputy-Speaker, the Chairman and Deputy Chairman must renounce all connections with political parties. I do not think that point is germane here. So far as I am concerned, I do not want to take shelter under a purely technical reason and to refuse consideration of these amendments, if you say that the amendment may be considered. But I do not think I will be in a position to accept any of them.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion moved:

> "That the Bill to provide for the salaries and allowances of certain officers of Parliament be taken into consideration."

Shri Punnoose (Alleppey): The hon. Minister mentioned about an amendment that I have tabled and he was pleased to observe that there is some technical objection about it. I had to command a lot of courage to speak on this particular Bill. As you know, it is rather delicate to speak on such a Bill in the context in which we are placed. Through the amendment I have tabled and also by the observations which I propose to make, I want to raise certain questions which, I believe affect the very basis of our democracy. On this occasion I want to emphasise certain aspects of our democratic and parliamentary life which I think should be considered in great detail by you, Sir, and also hon. Members of this House.

While making these observations or in tabling the amendment, I may state most categorically that there is no reference to any person, or to any incident or imputation of any motive, or casting of any aspersion. Far from it. I want to raise a constitutional issue. I believe that these Officers of Parliament, the Speaker, the Chairman, the Deputy-Speaker and the Deputy-Chairman should be above all party affiliations.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava (Gurgaon): Sir, may I rise to a point of order? Here we have a Bill regulating the salaries and allowances of Officers of Parliament. My friend is speaking about certain other qualification, namely, whether the Speaker or the Chairman could belong to this or that party. My humble submission is this is beyond the scope of this Bill. It only deals with the salaries and allowances of these Officers. That qualification which my friend wishes to speak about should have been considered at the time of the framing of the Constitution—whether the Speaker or the Chairman or the Deputy-Speaker or the Deputy-Chairman could belong to any party or not. So far as this Bill is concerned, my submission is that this discussion is beyond the scope of this Bill.

Shri Punnoose: May I make a submission? Constitution has provided that the salaries and allowances of these Officers of Parliament be decided by the Parliament itself. The Constitution does not preclude this Parliament from giving its views, when it appoints these Officers and fixes their salaries and allowances. The Parliament has got the right to say 'we expect this from them. There is nothing that prevents this House from doing so. I am not aware of any constitutional difficulty which would place my observations out of order.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: This will be adding one disqualification to the Members of the Parliament from standing for the post of Chairman or Speaker if they belong to any of the parties. This is tantamount to a disqualification to that post. Therefore,

[Pt. Thakur Das Bhargava.]

it was in the Constitution that we should have provided for it and not by a separate Bill. And even if a separate Bill is allowable for this purpose, there is no reason why we should extend the scope of the present Bill and include the disqualification in this Bill.

Shri Punnoose: The fear expressed by my hon. friend is far away from my thoughts, because any Member of any party can stand for these posts. But once they are elected to these posts they do not belong to any party, they belong to the whole House, and in them all parties have to repose their unconditional and unqualified faith. As such, from the date of their election to these august positions they should cease to be members or functionaries of political parties. That is my point.

Pandit K. C. Sharma (Meerut Distt.—South): Sir, on a point of order.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Let me dispose of this point of order—there is one point of order. I feel it rather delicate so far as this point of order is concerned. Of course I am not the only one Officer that is referred to here, nor is the reference individual. It is absolutely impersonal. Certainly, hon. Members are entitled to table any amendments and speak on them.

Regarding this particular amendment the position is this. This is a disqualification for any such person. This may be a separate thing. Now, if the hon. Speaker or the Chairman is prepared not to take a salary at all and work—after all, this amendment is under the impression that it is the salary that is the most important thing—if in an honorary capacity the Speaker or the Deputy-Speaker is prepared to work, is it the feeling of the hon. Member who has tabled this amendment that they may be allowed to do any amount of propaganda for a particular party? He thinks this is the screw by which they can be forced not to take such part! I mean it will be too small an estimate of the Speaker and the Deputy-Speaker that merely for money considerations they work. The Speaker and the Deputy-Speaker who for the time being are lawyers can go and earn at least a fraction of the amount, and if they go about carrying on propaganda for or against any party, what happens to the object of the hon. Member?

Therefore, this is an independent consideration. Under the Constitution it was not said. It is a matter which has to be established by convention. But I do not want to give a ruling on this because I am one of the parties concerned.

An Hon. Member: You are impartial.

Shri Gadgil (Poona Central): Let the hon. Member have his full say. Please do not rule it out of order because you are personally concerned. We have got effective answers.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If there is any another Chairman I will place him in the Chair and go, so that he may give a ruling. Anyhow, what I would say at this stage is this. This matter need not be raised now. When the stage of amendment comes in, another hon. Member, the Chairman, will take the place and give a ruling bringing to bear his independent judgment on the matter.

Shri V. P. Nayar (Chirayinkil): The point of order may raise similar difficulties for the Chairman also, if you vacate the Chair for the hon. Member who raised the point of order now!

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: The provisions of article 97 are obligatory. It may be that the House may fix a nominal salary of one rupee. But if it does not, it means that what is now obtaining under the Second Schedule will continue to obtain. They cannot negative the purpose of article 97. They might dilute it by saying that the Speaker and Deputy-Speaker and the Chairman and Deputy-Chairman shall get one rupee. But they have to say it, that there shall be something nominal and not something which is really substantial. That has to be said. It cannot be said in a negative manner. I think that is where the point raised by my hon. friend Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava was correct.

It is not merely a matter of embarrassment to you, Sir, where there is no question of salary. The real question at issue is whether article 97 should be taken as being mandatory so far as we are concerned. And if we do not exercise our right to fix the salary, what is obtaining before would continue to obtain. That is a proposition in which the Chair's personal predilections do not at all enter.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Personally I think it is a disqualification which ought to find a place in the Constitution if the House or the country large desires it. And so far as imposing a disqualification by Parliament, when there is no such disqualification in the Constitution, is concerned, it is matter which has to be canvassed.

As a disqualification it cannot be introduced in this Bill as a side-issue. In that way many other things also can be said—that the Speaker should know ten languages, he should know Hindi, Tamil, Telugu, he must have passed a test concerning the rules and points of order—all these things can also be imposed. Whether they are germane to this Bill is the only point. Personally I am not in favour of accepting this qualification. At this point of discussion, that is in the general discussion, this need not be entered into. At the time of amendments I shall consider what has to be done.

Shri Punnoose: I am thankful for the explanation, Sir. What I want to impress upon the House is that, just as Shri Gadgil said, we should try to build up a tradition by which these Officers of Parliament will be free from all party affiliations. In this as well as in other matters we have got the example of the House of Commons. I am not one of those who consider that in place and out of place we should blindly follow the example of the British House of Commons. Valuable as those experience are for us, it is open to us to have our own ways of doing things. But one cannot forget the fact that what we find in Britain today is the result of centuries of development, also, the result of the logic of events that have been taking shape all these centuries. Now they have come to a certain position where the Speaker is above all party politics. While replying to the felicitations from the floor of this House, the hon. Speaker made certain remarks about it on the day he was elected. He was pleased to say:

> "The position of the English Speaker is a matter of historical growth and it has been established at the end of centuries of struggle of the Commons for independence. Its evolution to the present stage has taken place after the establishment of the full authority of the Commons. The position is undoubtedly an ideal one provided it is accompanied by the other essential corollaries of democracy."

To the latter aspect of the sentence, I will come later on. He has openly admitted that that is the ideal for which we should strive. I must further quote, Sir, from the speech of the hon. the Chairman of the Council of States. He said:

> "I belong to no party and that means I belong to every party in this House. It shall be my endeavour to uphold the traditions, the highest traditions of parliamentary democracy and act towards every party with fairness and impartiality, with ill-will to none and goodwill to all."

Then he goes on to explain the position in the House of Commons and calls upon both the Government and the Opposition to behave in a fashion conducive to the healthy development of democracy in this country.

There appears to be some difference in the position of the Deputy-Speaker here and the Deputy-Speaker of the House of Commons. I feel that the position of the Deputy-Speaker here is entirely different from that of the Deputy-Speaker in the House of Commons. In the House of Commons, strictly speaking, there is not an officer as Deputy-Speaker. There is the Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee acting as the Deputy-Speaker. Previously the Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee was appointed by the leader of the House. In later years he was proposed by a Member of the Treasury Bench and voted into power by the ruling party. If you look into May's Parliamentary Practice, you will find that the Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee acts as the Deputy-Speaker only during the unavoidable absence of the Speaker. I wish I could read certain portions from May's Parliamentary Practice in this connection. The peculiarity of the position there is:

> "Standing Order No. 96 empowers the Speaker, after he has taken the Chair at the commencement of a sitting, without any formal communication to the House, to request the Chairman of Ways and Means or the Deputy Chairman to take the Chair, either temporarily or until the adjournment of the House; but before his Deputy can exercise the Speaker's powers under the Standing Order No. 29 and 31. the announcement of the Speaker's absence must be made".

The Speaker can vacate the Chair without even indicating the fact to the House but the moment the Chairman of Ways and Means Committee comes to occupy the Chair, the Seargent or the Clerk should announce that the Speaker is not there due to unavoidable reasons and then only the Deputy-Speaker can occupy the Chair. Before announcing that the absence of the Speaker is due to unavoidable reasons, the Deputy-Speaker cannot give rulings on certain important matters. Such restrictions are not here. Here, the Deputy-Speaker is a fulfledged officer of Parliament in

[Shri Punnoose]

whom confidence is reposed as in the Speaker himself. Therefore, any sort of comparison between the Deputy-Speaker of this august House and that of the House of Commons will be out of place.

Kumari Annie Mascarene (Trivandrum): Are we to follow the Westminster practice so blindly?

Shri Velayudhan (Quilon *cum* Mavelikkara—Reserved—Sch. castes): This can be a better arrangement.

Shri Punnoose: I am sure my friend will get more light when we go further. Therefore, what I want to make out is that these officers should be looked upon as persons occupying positions in which all the Members have to place their trust, their unqualified trust at all times. Previously—in the beginning—the position of the Speaker of the House of Commons itself was that of a Deputy or nominee of the Crown but gradually that changed. Today he is the guardian of the rights and privileges of the whole House, of each and every Member and he is kept out of all party loyalties. Here the hon. Speaker has said in unmistakable terms that this is the ideal for which we should strive. I hope there will be absolutely no difference between the concept of the Speaker and the Deputy-Speaker entertained by the hon. friends on that side and by those on this side of the House. What I feel is that there is a difference between this concept and practice. There is a contradiction between what we think about them and what is actually in practice today. It may not be due to the fault of any one but it is for us to bring existing practice in consonance with the concept we all entertain. The hon. Speaker when he replied to the felicitations made another point. He said:

> "We have yet to evolve political parties and healthy conventions..."

Then he goes on:

> "From this point of view as also from my moorings in the past, I cannot be out of the great organisation, the Indian National Congress, under whose banner I have had the privilege of serving, in one capacity or another, for the last 40 years. I therefore continue to be a Congressman just as any Indian can continue to be a Hindu or a Muslim or a Parsee, etc., and still he is no less an Indian so far as the national questions are concerned".

Here we are placed in a difficulty. What exactly is the relationship between this organisation called the Indian National Congress and the party that is functioning here on behalf of the Congress? That is a difference which this House cannot understand. I could show a number of statements made by the hon. Prime Minister, the Leader of the House, in his capacity both as the Prime Minister and the President of the Congress to the effect that the Congress is fast becoming a party, and that it has ceased to be a movement. For all practical purposes, the Indian National Congress is the ruling party in this country today and the Speaker says that as a result of his moorings in the past, he cannot remain out of the Congress. I would like to know whether it is not obligatory on the part of a member of the Congress to stand for its programme and to stand for its objectives also. If it is obligatory on the part of a member of the Congress to stand for its programme, I am afraid the Speaker has certain obligations from which he cannot escape.

Then coming to the Deputy-Speaker, we read the other day in the papers that he is elected to the Executive Committee of the Congress Parliamentary Party. I have a copy of the Constitution of the Congress Parliamentary Party and the Executive Committee has got certain definite funcions there. It is not a big body. It is a committee of the very select, very elite stalwart fighters of the party, who are supposed to stand through thick and thin for the party. The Executive Committee has got certain functions which are specifically mentioned here. Fifteen members elected by the members of the Congress party who are Members of the House of the People and six members elected by the Congress party will be the Executive Committee of the Congress party in the Parliament. It is said:

> "The Executive Committee shall have power to examine all motions, amendments, or Bills proposed to be made or introduced in Parliament of India by any Member and to approve, modify or reject the same according as they are in accordance with or contrary to the programme and policy of the Congress."

Mark they will have power to accept, modify or reject according as they are in accordance with or contrary to the programme and policy of the Congress. It is obligatory on the hon. Deputy-Speaker, in his capacity as a member of the Executive Committee, to sit in judgment on every motion, on every amendment and every Bill and every Resolution coming up in this House and he, or in his absence, the Committee of which he is a part, takes decisions. I would very much appeal to you to consider whether this will produce a healthy sense of impartiality and will inevitably command the unqualified trust which is expected of us all by this august office which you occupy.

The position is this. We have, in this country, to tackle a lot of difficult problems. Problems which the British Parliamentary democracy had not to face in its long travel through the centuries we are called upon to face. Problems arising out of Party conflicts, and class conflicts have cropped up. At such a time, in order to develop democratic movement in this country, for the preservation of the democracy for which we have paid a heavy price, the Speaker and the Deputy-Speaker, occupying this Chair should give us the confidence that there is nothing that can prevent them from doing full justice. We very often come to you and talk to you on the rostrum. Sir, but, when the Whip of the Congress party mounts the rostrum, I get a shudder because he is the Whip of the party of which the hon. Deputy-Speaker is a Member. Is it a position that has to be encouraged?

I have to make one or two observations more. We have sometimes seen you at close quarters. Sometimes I have felt that some of the most undesirable, I mean, unenviable positions in the world are the positions of the Speaker and the Deputy-Speaker.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Certainly not undesirable.

Shri Punnoose: I have had occasion to go to his Chamber, more often to the Deputy-Speaker than to the hon. Speaker. Sometimes, I have come away without telling him what I wanted to say. Because, I have seen him being pestered with all kinds of problems; all points of order go to him. All sorts of amendments, requests and explanations are there before him every moment. From that point of view also, this House has got a right to demand that his whole, entire, undivided attention should be placed at the disposal of the House. I cannot commend, Sir, I cannot appreciate for a moment the way in which the services of these very respectable gentlemen occupying such august positions have been utilised by the Party in power.

I place my case on two points: on a matter of principle and on a matter of practical necessity. On a matter of principle, because that is the foundation on which we have to build. You say that the Communists in this House have no faith in Parliamentary democracy and that they are not democrats and that you on the other side are wonderful democrats. (*An Hon. Member*: Wonderful?) Yes. You must make these disbelievers, doubting Thomases believe and give them more reason for faith. This will be one step in that direction. You have to take a very courageous step. I hope the Speaker and the Deputy-Speaker, the Chairman and the Deputy Chairman will fully appreciate the position. I believe there will be practical agreement among the Members of this House also, unless the whip works havoc. Because, I know, many of the Congressmen on the other side also want democratic institutions to develop in this country. And then it is humanly impossible for the Speaker or the Deputy-Speaker to discharge their functions as office-bearers of this House, and at the same time, to look after the interests of some party.

With these words, I place my views on the Bill before the House.

Shri K. C. Sodhia (Sagar): I may be given two minutes, Sir.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I will call Mr. Gadgil first and then others.

Shri Gadgil (Poona Central): I have heard the speech of my hon. friend with very great attention. He will readily agree with me that when a Party is elected at the general elections with a majority, certain political and parliamentary results flow therefrom. If according to the Constitution and the rules of business in the House, certain offices in the Parliament are subject to election, they are subject to election with all the known facts that the majority has a particular political colour. If you are to lay down a proposition as broad and as tall as has been sought to be laid down by my esteemed friend just now, that because a candidate for the Speakership or the Deputy-Speakership belongs to a particular party, he must be penalised either by not allowing to stand or, if he is elected, by not paying him: (*Some Hon. Members*: No, no.) or, instead of doing this, that he should resign from his particular party......

Shri Punnoose: May I make a personal explanation, Sir?

Shri Gadgil: May I put it this way? I have a driver who is excellent in his job of driving very well. Am I to dismiss him because he is a member of

[Shri Gadgil]

the Communist party or a trade union? It will be absurd.

Shri B. S. Murthy: Sir, on a point of order, is the hon. Member correct in his comparison, in his analogy between his driver and the Speaker of the House?

Shri Gadgil: I regret that my hon. friend lacks completely a sense of humour.

Now, proceeding with the arguments. The tradition that has been established in England with respect to the high office of Speaker was not built in a day and that has been agreed by my hon. friend. We have also our own tradition. We have not written on a *tabula rasa* even in this matter just as we have not written our Constitution on a clean slate. We have certain historic precedents. Now, before this Parliament came into existence, there was a Central Assembly, and election to the Presidentship or Deputy-Presidentship always went on political considerations. What was only relevant for the purpose was whether a particular man, after having been elected and having become the occupant of this high office, was impartial or not in the conduct of business. That is the only test. We must differentiate between the functions to be discharged and the political colour of the particular person. Is it the case of my hon. friend here that because the hon. Deputy-Speaker or the Speaker of this House, or the Chairman or the Deputy-Chairman of the other House, has shown a partiality for the members of or for the Party which has put him in office—if that is the case, the line of argument, so far as I am concerned, would be different, but my hon. friend has very subtly but very fairly put the proposition and wants to make out a case that there should not be a situation in which duty and interest will conflict,— if I understand him correctly.

Shri Punnoose: Here it is duty that conflicts with duty. Duty as Executive Member of the Congress Party, comes into conflict with duty as the Deputy-Speaker.

Shri Gadgil: Interest as a party-man. That is how I understand.

Babu Ramnarayan Singh (Hazaribagh West): A party-man is always a party-man!

Shri Gadgil: Let us compare the traditions in England and the traditions in India. Was our Speaker elected uncontested? I want to know that. Even in the General Elections he was opposed. The tradition in England is that if the outgoing Speaker seeks re-election, then—it is a convention well understood and well followed—he is not opposed. He is elected and then elected as Speaker. What happened here? After he was opposed in the General Elections he was returned. When he was again proposed by the majority Party, and very rightly—they were within their right—for occupation of this high office, he was also opposed. Now, having not followed the tradition in England in all these essential preliminaries, you only want us to follow the net product because it suits you for the time being. I am not questioning your motives in the least. (*An Hon. Member*: No!) I entirely agree that you want to do it in the best interests of Parliamentary tradition, but a tradition is not a thing which can be built up within the twinkling of an eye. It takes quite a long time, and it is not possible unless all the Parties agree that there must be certain fundamental things which must be beyond the dispute or discussion of any momentary passions or emotions. Now as regards the Speaker of this hon. House,—I am not referring to the fact that I am his personal friend—even in 1946 and 1947 when those were very troublesome times, I need not refer to how the passions were raised—not a single Member of the Muslim League raised any doubt about the impartiality in the conduct of the business of this House.

Shri Punnoose: That is due to the merits of the person occupying the office, and not due to the merit of the arrangement.

Shri Gadgil: There was election. In spite of the momentary lapses occasionally on the part of some friends here and there, by and large the impression I have gathered so far as the Opposition Members are concerned is that they have a fair faith in the impartiality of the Speaker. Now, it is very difficult—you can just imagine how difficult it is—for a man to give up all his political inclinations or instincts or views which he may have built up in the course of his political life extending over more than a quarter of a century. By changing the clothes you cannot change the colour of your skin (*Interruption.*) By assuming office, you cannot entirely get rid of your political opinion, but the real test is: what are the expectations of this particular office, and how he is expected to conduct the business of the House. If we come to the conclusion that he has done it satisfactorily, not only before he was elected—we have a history of it—and even in this House, then we must stop at that, and as far as the Speaker of this House is concerned, we are all agreed that he has done and discharged his task very nicely.

Now comes the case of the Deputy-Speaker. Extracts were read from the Constitution of the Congress Parliamentary Party. If the Congress Parliamentary Party lays down that whatever be the whip it has to be honoured by every Member of the Party, I think similar provision is to be found in the Constitution of every Party, including the Communist Party. (*An Hon. Member*: They have no Constitution) I have not the slightest doubt that if there is deviation or non-compliance with the whip of the Party, the punishment meted out to the Member of the Communist Party is any day greater, stronger and more intense than the punishment meted out to the Member of the Congress Party, but that is not the great point. The great point is while he is in the Chair, how does the whip of the Congress Party affect him in the conduct of the business of the House? (*An Hon. Member*: Why not?) Does the whip tell him that he must not allow more time to the Members of the Opposition, or that he must not allow a particular Member to speak, or that he should not allow a particular Member to move his Amendment, this, that and the other? (*Interruption*). The conduct is prescribed by the Business Manual, and so far as the Deputy-Speaker who is in the Chair is concerned, my own grievance is that he is definitely against us, Members of the Congress Party. (*Interruption*)

Shri Punnoose: On a point of order, Sir. Is the hon. Member in order to say that the Deputy-Speaker has been unfair to the Congress Party?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We are dealing with the subject most impersonally, and the point that has been raised by Mr. Punnoose is on two grounds. It may possibly create a suspicion. Then, that suspicion ought to be removed. That is his first point. Secondly, entering into personalities may be very interesting. I know what the hon. Member means. He has got very great affection for me personally, but it may raise other controversies. Therefore, let there be no personal reference to me either for or against. So far as this debate is concerned, let it proceed absolutely impersonally. The other point is whether this is all relevant. I leave it to the House. I have made up my mind not to give a ruling on the point of order. It is for the House to decide.

Enough discussion has gone on, but I will allow more hon. Members to take part in the discussion, and ultimately the House may decide whether in the situation in which we are, that qualification ought to be imposed and whether even though it might be conceded, it has to be discussed on a different proceeding, and whether it ought to be done here as part of the discussion on this Bill. With respect to general principles, comparison with the House of Commons etc., all that can be done. I would only appeal to hon. Members not to make any reference to my individual acts so far, and how I have been doing in this House. It is not necessary, and I may be in this House or I may not be in this House, but this is for all time to come. In a dispassionate mood hon. Members will address themselves to the principles and how far this should be allowed or not allowed.

Shri S. S. More (Sholapur): On a point of clarification. Because we are discussing a principle and we cannot discuss principles hanging in the air, some facts will have to be marshalled in support of particular arguments. Can we not refer to facts even about your own conduct if we want to substantiate a particular point?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Leave alone my conduct. We are now dealing only with the Speaker's salary or that of the Chairman in the other House. I think it will be out of place to make any reference to the Speaker for the time being. If any hon. Member is dissatisfied with the Speaker or the Deputy-Speaker or the Chairman or Vice-Chairman, there are other provisions. A non-Party man is liable to abuse his position as much as a Party-man if he does not want to be just, but we are now concerned with the point as to how far the Party will have any influence on him. Those are the general principles. In those circumstances, I do not think any individual reference should be made for or against, or showering of bouquets on the one side and brickbats on the other. That may be avoided as far as possible.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta North-East): May I point out one thing? I quite agree with you, Sir, that this debate should be proceeded with in a perfectly impersonal manner. But, reference has already been made to statement made from the Chair by a Member in this House which raised certain questions of principle regarding the position of the Speaker *vis-a-vis* the political life of our country. Now, that is a subject, Sir, which is one instance of the subjects which can be discussed impersonally. In relation to a discussion of that subject, possibly certain

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

other illustrative factors might have to be referred to. I entirely agree with you that so far as the conduct of the Chair in this House is concerned, we should not make any specific references to instances where the Chair has given a ruling one way or the other. I agree with you entirely. But in regard to the general question of the position of the Speaker *vis-a-vis* the political life of this country, and in regard also to the general question of the repercussion of the statement made by the Speaker of our House on the general conduct of Parliamentary proceedings, I submit we have a right to make our submissions that are related to the Bill under discussion, by showing the role of the Chair in our parliamentary setup and then discussing the emoluments and other things which are now proposed to be given.

Shri Gadgil: Sir, I have not finished. To continue, the point I was making was that the test is whether the functions as are expected of the Deputy-Speaker are properly and fairly discharged or not. If you insist that on his being elected as a Deputy-Speaker, he must resign from the party from which he is elected, you are penalising the majority of the Members. (*Interruptions*) Understand the implication of it. This House consists of 369 Congressmen, and we have a right because of the majority.

An Hon. Member: Right to what?

Shri Gadgil: So long as we are here. We are here. It will be an age before you come over here.

The point is that you are denying that right to the majority. That right, as I stated in the beginning is that as soon as a party is elected in a majority, certain political and parliamentary consequences follow. This is one of them. The argument advanced is that because the Deputy-Speaker is a member of the Congress Executive or a member of the Congress party, a whip will be issued, which will control him. The Whip will control his voting only and not the conduct by him as Deputy-Speaker, so far as the business of the House is concerned.

Then you have to consider not only what I said about the Deputy-Speaker just now, but also the other consequences, if we were to accept in toto what has been suggested by my friend there. Now, is he a full-time officer? He may be a part-time officer here, and not a full-time officer like the Speaker. If he is a part time officer, and the sum given is not adequate for him, is he to give up everything else, and all the other facilities, advantages or benefits, that are incidental to the membership of a particular political party. (*Interruptions*). Do not think that way, simply because you happen to be in the Opposition. Take a larger view. Let us all agree that certain traditions have to be built, and those traditions require that in the conduct of business, whether it be the Speaker or the Deputy-Speaker, he must be absolutely impartial and should maintain the tradition of democratic discussion.

Now according to numbers, the Opposition is entitled to not more than 1/4th of the time of the House. But they are actually getting roundabout 35 per cent., sometimes 40 per cent. and sometimes even equal time, and I have no grievance about that except on certain occasions when I am not called. The point is that the minority has naturally a right to enjoy some weightage in the point of time, and very recently the position with respect to the majority *vis-a-vis* the Opposition was examined in the House of Commons, and it was found that the minority party did get a little more time, and that that little more must be given. They may be small in number, but we cannot count the volume or the weight of any argument by merely counting the heads or the hands. Therefore so far as what the present Deputy-Speaker has done is concerned, although I complain that he is unfair to the Congress party—but that was only to provoke him to say what he actually said......

[SHRI PATASKAR *in the Chair*]

Shri Punnoose: On a point of order, Sir. (*Interruptions*).

Shri Gadgil: But, Sir, I respectfully submit that this is not the time, because you have not given enough time for the growing of traditions.

Shri Punnoose: On a point of order, Sir. He is repeatedly saying that the Deputy-Speaker or the Speaker has been unfair to the Congress party. He may consider himself too much near the Speaker, but it is our duty to protect the dignity of the Chair. (*Interruptions*).

11 A.M.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member may proceed.

Shri V. P. Nayar: What is your ruling, Sir?

Mr. Chairman: I just occupied the Chair. I do not know what reference he made. But the point is that I do not think any hon. Member can make a reference to the Deputy-Speaker or Speaker....

Shri S. S. More: If he has made any reference, it should be expunged from the record. (*Interruptions*).

Shri Gadgil: You see, I referred to the practice in the House of Commons, not here.

Shri S. S. More: He is referring to the practice of the Deputy-Speaker here. (*Interruptions*).

Shri Gadgil: My hon. friend seems to have curious ideas of what is relevant and not.

The question is whether democratic discussion and traditions have been observed here or not. Though we had very little time from the start of our democracy, my own humble view is that we have kept up the traditions so far very well. If further traditions are to be built, we must allow some passage of time before we can think one way or the other. Do not try to take advantage of the present Bill for introducing something, which, to say the least, is not relevant.

Pandit K. C. Sharma (Meerut Distt.—South): I have heard very attentively the speech of my hon. friend Mr. Punnoose, the Communist Member on the opposite side, and I am surprised at it. I could not understand the vehemence with which he put forward his case. The question in this Bill is a simple one, it is one of fixing the salaries, and not one of prescribing the rules for the conduct of the Speaker or the Deputy-Speaker. So, from that viewpoint, all his observations are irrelevant.

Shri Punnoose: On a point of order Sir. He is referring to a speech made on the floor of the House. I believe the Deputy-Speaker or the Chairman will never allow any irrelevant matter to be said on the Bill. And yet he says that irrelevant remarks have been made.

An Hon. Member: That is the power of the Chair.

Pandit K. C. Sharma: There are many questions which may be admitted, but yet they may not be relevant.

What I was submitting is that this is not a Bill for prescribing the rules of conduct for the Speaker or the Deputy-Speaker. It is a Bill for paying the salaries to them, and to that extent, it has not much, if not no, relevancy if the question is brought in whether they should abide by the rules of the party and should be associated with the party, once they are elected, or whether they should dissociate themselves completely from their party, the moment they are elected to their offices.

The Congress party came into power in different provinces in 1937, and one of the great Speakers of a Provincial Assembly is here, the hon. Mr. Purushottamdas Tandon. And to his credit, I must say that no less a man than the Nawab of Chattari paid the highest compliment that could be possibly paid to any Chair whatsoever, that never in his long career as a parliamentarian, had he any reason whatsoever to doubt the integrity of the Chair.

Babu Ramnarayan Singh: Who is the second Tandon?

Pandit K. C. Sharma: In many other provinces also, under the 1935 constitution, the Congressmen occupied the Chairs; they remained members of the party, and yet there never arose any question as to the Chair favouring one party and disfavouring another party. There was nothing to doubt the integrity of the Chair in any way whatsoever.

Sir, I may point out that there is a provision about the contempt of court. There a High Court Judge can punish an offence against himself. But there has never been any question about the integrity of any Judge, that he gave a wrong judgment because the offence was against his very person. What I am driving at is that there is a difference between personal inclination and the demand of the function of the Chair. When you are in a certain place, in a certain responsible office, that office itself has certain obligations, it has itself certain traditions, certain antecedents and certain conventions. And those traditions, conventions, obligations and duties work on the mind of the person—an average man. It is much more so in the case of a brilliant man. An average man does not occupy the Chair. It

[Pandit K. C. Sharma]

is generally the man above the average that occupies the Chair. So even the average man will play his part well when he is placed in a responsible office. So we would be discrediting our own intelligence—of the Members of this hon. House—by saying that in order to be independent, in order to be fair to every section of the House, one must resign from the party which got him elected to the seat. This is not a fair way of dealing with the question.

It is not that today the hon. Speaker or the Deputy-Speaker has been elected to the Chair. They have been working here for so many years and no question has ever arisen that any disfavour or any favour has been shown to any particular party. The things are going well and it is to the credit of all of us. So I do not think that there arises any question whatsoever that they must resign or dissociate themselves from the party on the ticket of which they have been elected to their office. With these words, I resume my seat.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Basirhat): I just want to say a few words in answer to Mr. Gadgil. I did not quite follow what he really meant by saying we are trying to attack the right of the majority party, because I think that is a completely wrong way of putting the entire matter. What we have tried to point out is this: that certainly in this House every particular individual who has been elected has been elected on a party ticket and as such, he remains a political being until such time as he is elected as Speaker or Deputy-Speaker. Once he is elected as Speaker or Deputy Speaker, every effort must be made to take away from him any extraneous tags and strings which he may have to any particular political party.

Babu Ramnarayan Singh: Hear, hear.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: That is the position which we want to make very clear. This, I think, has nothing to do with attacking the right of the majority; because it is true that as far as the mental make-up goes, it is very difficult to judge at what time you remain a Congressman and at what time you do not remain a Congressman, and there are many occasions when many people may feel that the scales of justice which the Speaker is supposed to hold may be tipping over to the side of his party. But that granted, you who tell us so many things about the values of parliamentary practice and always preach to us about the dignity of the House, when the ears of our friends on the opposite side are so very delicate that they cannot hear such words as 'unworthy' being uttered, such things have to be expunged from the proceedings of this House; it is right that at least such matters should be cleared up whereby we can in some manner, even though very little, expect this much, that the Speaker or the Deputy-Speaker may not have any extraneous tags to any political party. That is the point we wanted to make clear.

Then coming to certain other points, I should like to say, that when the Speaker or the Deputy-Speaker becomes elected to executive positions, is a party machinery, then it becomes very difficult for them to balance and keep true to their jobs as well as the principles enunciated by the very fact of their being executive members. For instance, Sir, the Executive Committee of the Congress Parliamentary Party has the power to examine all motions, amendments, and Bills proposed to be moved or introduced in the Parliament of India by any member and to approve, modify or reject the same according as they are in accordance with or contrary to the programme and policy of the Congress. Mark these last few words, 'contrary to the programme and policy of the Congress party', not contrary to the rules of this Parliament. If it had been only judged from this standard that it is contrary to the rules of this Parliament, it is absolutely all right. But when they have already judged whether a particular Bill or amendment or an adjournment motion is not or is contrary to the programme and the policy of the Congress party, to sit in judgment on that from that august Chair, I think, is not correct. And therefore, we say that to be in an executive position in a party and at the same time try to wield with the air of impartiality the role of the Speaker is not possible.

Now, let us come to certain other points. It is true that this Bill has been brought with the ostensible reason that we have to make such allowances and give such facilities to the Speaker and the Deputy-Speaker in order to keep up the position and dignity of this House. Now the words 'position' and 'dignity' are not absolute terms. When we think of this vast country of ours, the tribulations through which our people are passing, that dignity has to be looked upon in the background of the dignity we are trying to attain for the masses of the people who are today struggling for elementary human rights and human dignity, for a square meal and a piece of cloth for the starving, naked peasants and workers. They have been bled white by years of exploitation and we are struggling against that poverty. It is against that background that we have to set up standards of dignity and of position even for the highest dignitaries of this august House. It is true we want that the Speaker should be on a par at least with the Ministers. In that, we have no quarrel. But you may remember, Sir, when the question of emoluments to the Ministers came up before this House, we made our position clear—that although the Ministers and the Speaker should be on a par, we have to judge what are the standards we are going to lay down at this particular moment of time for our Speaker and for our Deputy-Speaker which will remain consonant with the dignity of this House. And not only that; much greater than the dignity of this House is the dignity of this nation, because 'dignity' is not an absolute term. Now, if we are to judge things from absolute standards of dignity, we can ask for Rs. 4,000 or 5,000 or even 6,000, as the Executive Councillors of the British days did—and I think you can say that it will not be too superfluous; you can use that money, if you judge it from absolute standards. Nor do I by putting forward my amendment demand that the pegging of the standards should be to the standards of the lowest in the land—I am not even demanding that. I do not say that the Speaker or the Deputy-Speaker should be pegged to the standard of the peasant in the village or even the working man in the town. But I do demand that we have to work out a golden mean.

You talk of dignity. The refugees, who are there on the platform of Sealdah, did they not have dignity? About three years ago, many of them owned big houses: they were wealthy people, many of them: But, what is their position today? They have to beg even for a square meal. Those who were pretty wealthy, whom we used to call the people of the *bhadra log* class in our language, what happens to them when they are unemployed? Their dignity has to be lowered to the standards and to the money which they are able to get. Therefore, Sir, I would say, we have to consider matters, in the context of the rising unemployment, in the context of the sacrifices of the refugees, in the context of the country where the *per capita* income is Rs. 25 a month—I do not mean that the Speaker and Deputy Speaker should get the same—let them have 25 times 25—this is what we want to be considered. We are demanding that the Speaker should be given a thousand rupees and with the other emoluments that have been mentioned in the Bill—we are not cutting them down, we are not cutting down the house facilities, we are not cutting down the rates and taxes etc., the maintenance of the garden and other things that have been mentioned in the Bill—but we do say that the basic amount which will be given must be consonant to the general level of poverty, the general level of sacrifices that we are demanding from the people. Without that, Sir, I think you will not be able to enthuse people whom you are asking to make sacrifices. You are cutting down the wages of the workers. When the question of employment and wages come, you say that you have not got the money. I say, considered in that background how can we ask for emoluments, which, if you calculate, come to a colossal amount. You say, 'we give to the Speaker Rs. 2,250 as salary, which is lower than what was given to the Speaker of the Provisional Parliament or the Constituent Assembly.' But, if you add on to that all the other facilities which you are going to give to him, free house—today in Delhi if you pay rent for the buildings equivalent to the buildings that are being occupied by hon. Ministers and Speaker, I am sure you will not get them for less than Rs. 1,000 (*An Hon Member*: Rs. 3,000) I am giving the benefit of doubt to him —staff quarters, and other buildings appurtenant thereto and taxes, water, electricity etc., it will come up to Rs. 4,000.

You have got Rs. 500, sumptuary allowance. I think, in the context of today, this sumptuary allowance is something which we cannot allow. The upper middle classes the people drawing Rs. 700 and Rs. 800 as salaries have got their relations etc. They turn round and say, 'you are wealthy people; look at our families, can we draw sumptuary allowances? We have our relations in the provinces; we have our family relations in East Bengal and we have to maintain 10 or 15 people extra; we would like to draw sumptuary allowances from our offices'. Therefore, this sumptuary allowance should not be allowed. If we are unable to entertain people, then we tell the people, 'you are making sacrifices, we too shall sacrifice, we shall live austerely'. We have heard that in the old days parties etc. were given on a more large and lavish scale than today. When the Congress government came they cut it down to some extent but they still continue. Let us be quite frank and

[Shrimati Renu Chakravartty]

tell the people. They will appreciate it when we say that we are going to cut down all extra costs. I am sure the M.Ps. and other friends who were being invited from time to time will certainly appreciate that in order to enthuse the people from whom we ask for sacrifices, because we are the first to make those sacrifices.

I should also like to make a point of medical facilities. As you have noted in my amendment, I have not cut it because, I think, it is a very correct thing that when we ask any government servant or officer to serve the government, we must make all possible arrangements for their families and their own health. That is right. The principle is absolutely right. But, here, I will make certain observations. Why is it that we make differences between higher and big officials of the State, the Ministers and others, and class III servants. For instance, Sir, we lately know that in the railways the families of class III servants have been excluded from getting treatment in the railway hospitals. We have to guard these persons who are drawing such low scales of salary from falling a prey to such diseases as T.B. in larger and larger numbers. These facilities are withdrawn from them, while, at the same time, we are giving these facilities to the highest dignitaries of the States. These are the discrepancies or differentiations which you are making between class and class. We admit, that all government servants, whether they are Speakers, Deputy Speakers, Ministers or Deputy Ministers or class IV servants, all must be given the same facilities of having themselves and their families treated free at government expense.

I believe during the last debate on a similar Bill, some people said that there are certain facilities given to government servants in Delhi. As far as I know, in Calcutta or certain other places, there are hardly any facilities for the treatment even of government servants. They are sent to the government hospitals which are generally overcrowded. In the alternative, they are allowed to go to doctors whose fees are not more than say, Rs. 2 or Rs. 4. These are the rules laid down by the department and it is almost next to impossible for them to get specialised treatment, the treatment of specialists. These are things that should not happen; there should be no discrepancy, no differentiation. That is my point.

Now when such a debate was held last time, Dr. Katju made a long speech about the very sad state of affairs, about how the Ministers found it so very difficult to maintain their families, how they have got their daughters to be married, their sons to be educated, their cars were not sufficient and so on. We have no objection to people having motor cars. Some of us also would appreciate having motor cars; certainly, with motor cars we can do our jobs much better. Even people drawing Rs. 700 or Rs. 800 as salary, they too have got their motor cars. I am not talking of the under-dog, the class III or class IV servants. These officers whom you are always very careful of protecting even though you may get complaints from us against them, keep cars. Why then do you want a bigger salary than them? As far as travelling goes, you have not got to incur any expenditure. That is also being covered by the Bill. All right take it. We shall certainly give everything that is necessary for your effective functioning. But, you must also show to the people that you are prepared to make sacrifices, you are also prepared to forego many things that 99 per cent. of our people are unable to get. Many of our people, when they come to Delhi, tell us, 'you are in luxury, you have got all these things, all these facilities'. 'You are talking to us of national reconstruction, you are asking us to make so many sacrifices, but when it comes to you, then the standard of differentiation is so very great'. Let it not be said that we do not mean to raise the standard of the people; if you can do that, if you can make their *per capita* income go up, you may have not only Rs. 2,000 or Rs. 3,000 but you may have Rs. 10,000, provided that the difference is not very large between the ordinary man who is toiling and, tilling the soil and the person who sits in the Chair there. I think that is in keeping with the dignity of the House. That is why I have proposed my amendment, Sir.

Shri Namdhari (Fazilka-Sirsa): I come to the speech of the mover of the amendment, which was most irrelevant and I say that except having value as an amendment, it has got nothing to do with the Bill. The Bill speaks only of the salaries and other things, and not whether he belongs to a party or a non-party man. That question does not arise. The object of the mover is to sabotage the present working of the Parliament because that is their profession.

Two villagers were going on, and they said let us start making poetry. One man was a poet and the other man was not. He said, 'Well, I will also reply'. The first man, who was a poet, said:

जाट रे जाट तेरे सिर पर खाट ।

The other man replied:

तेली रे तेली तेरे सिर पर कोल्हू ।

So, we can understand these people. Now, they are very clever, intellectuals. We have got a great respect for them. I know they have been trained. As I said the other day, they are graduates of the Fox University. We understand that very well. About the medical arrangements, one respected and hon. gentleman objected. They must understand that the Speaker or the Deputy-Speaker occupies a sacred chair. They have to control the work of the Parliament on behalf of the entire nation. Every minute spent in Parliament costs Rs. 50. We just cannot allow either the Speaker or the Deputy-Speaker to fall ill. We must give them the best medical amenities to keep themselves always in order.

I did not understand the argument of the hon. and very intellectual Lady Member, when she said, "One of them is a member of the Congress Parliamentary Party. He has to consider over the Bills there, and again he has to regulate the proceedings on those Bills here." She asked, "How can such a person be the Deputy-Speaker?" She made an indirect attack. I know she is very good. But I want to remove her misunderstanding.

Whatever Bill is passed is passed by the vote of the Parliament, not by the vote of the Chair. So, as far as that aspect is concerned, she need not worry in any way. He can give his noble opinion there in the Party meeting, and still he can come here and guide the deliberations on right lines.

In England, the Speaker or the Deputy-Speaker do not belong to a party. Perhaps, the hon. gentlemen do not know that there is no contest there for their seats. The election is uncontested. But what about France? What about our own country? Were their opponents members of the Opposition parties or not? You must understand these things.

Luckily, we have such noble Indian personalities, such God-blessed personalities, that by taking their names we are reminded of our Almighty Father. One is Dr. Radhakrishnan. The other is Shri Ganesh Vasudev Mavalankar. The third is Shri Ananthasayanam Ayyangar. We have such beautiful personalities. We are very lucky to get such noble persons who will guide us outwardly, mentally, physically and also inwardly.

So, I would tell my Opposition friends not to say such things. I know, you are our own blood and our own people. Naturally, if something goes wrong with somebody in the family, we have to cure him with love. My hon. friend who has tabled this amendment should know how nicely and affectionately the Speaker and the Deputy-Speaker treat all parties, whether they be Congress or otherwise.

At the same time, we have noble personalities from the Opposition also adorning the Chair. You have Sardar Hukam Singh. Then you have the great and hon. Lady Member, Shrimati Renu Chakravartty. When they are taken in the panel, how can you say that stepmotherly treatment is being given to you? We should be proud that we have got such noble personalities. You ought to know the tradition that has been established. You are very clever people. Sometimes, you go up, but again you come to the earth. So, you should definitely know all these things.

Shri Nambiar: Are his feet in the earth?

Shri Namdhari: You know that an Indian will do everything for the common man. We have abolished rajas and maharajas and zamindars. But still those people will never change. They are still sons of *Bharatmata*. You know that your Communist Party will never come into power. So you think that at least you can sabotage the working of Parliament. That is a good way. It is just like the fox saying—

'अंगूर खट्टे हैं ।' उसे तो पहुंचना हैं नहीं दूसरे का क्यों न बिगाड़ दिया जाय ।

It has no more value than that. The speech was very nice.

One honorary magistrate never got a case for three months. He was wondering what to do. There was no case at all. So, he called one respectable gentleman. That gentleman asked him. "What for did you call me?" The magistrate said, "I am fining you Rs. 500." The gentleman enquired, "But what have I done? I have committed no fault." The magistrate replied, "Well, if you have not committed any crime for several years, am I responsible for that? I must fine you!" This is also just like that.

[Shri Namdhari]

Because you do not get any substantial thing to oppose the Bill, you think: well, why not start something? You must always start something. That is your profession.

Anyway, I want to tell my hon. friends that we are lucky in having such great personalities to give us intellectual and spiritual light. So, we must not oppose this Bill. We have taken the very great and noble personality, Shrimati Renu Chakravartty, in the panel. What more do you want?

बाबू रामनारायण सिंह : सभापति महोदय, जिस विषय पर अभी बातें हो रही हैं वह बहुत ही महत्वपूर्ण विषय है । आप ने मुझे इस में भाग लेने का मौका दिया, इस के लिये मैं आप को धन्यवाद देता हूं ।

सभापति जी, सरकारी अफसरों के वेतन के सम्बन्ध में मैं इस संसद् में बहुत बार बोल चुका हूं । उस को वेतन तो कहना ही नहीं चाहिये । जनता की आमदनी को देख कर, जनता की हालत को देख कर देश में वेतन का निर्धारण होता है । जो वेतन आज कल हमारे यहां चल रहे हैं वह अंगरेजों के काल से चल रहे हैं, वह हमारे देश को लूटते थे और आपस में बांटते थे और हिन्दुस्तानियों को भी कुछ हिस्सा दे देते थे । मुझे दुःख के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि जो तर्ज अंग्रेज सरकार का था, आज भी वही तर्ज ज्यों का त्यों चल रहा है । सभापति महोदय, किसी देश में कोई भी सरकार हो, उस को देश की सेवक होकर ही रहने का हक है, मालिक हो कर नहीं । आज हमारे देश में आप जा कर देखिये तो जनता भूखों मरती है और सरकार के लोग मौज करते हैं । तो यह तो चला आ रहा है । न जाने यह पाप कब तक धुल पायेगा । यह तो भगवान ही जानता है । मैं तो परमात्मा से यही मनाता हूं कि हिन्दुस्तान में न्याय का राज्य हो । इस वास्ते वेतन के सम्बन्ध में मैं ज्यादा नहीं बोलूंगा । यह बात तो बिल्कुल गड़बड़ है ही । देश को आज भी लूटा जा रहा है और लूटने वाले आपस में बांटते हैं ।

अभी जो बात उठाई गई है, अर्थात् लोगों ने जो यह कहा कि जो ऐसी ऐसी संस्थाओं के सभापति होते हैं, उनको किसी पार्टी का आदमी नहीं होना चाहिये । यह सुन कर तो मुझे बहुत ही आनन्द हुआ । मेरा तो यह विचार है कि अगर देश में कभी भी न्याय होना है तो जितने प्रकार की दलबन्दियां है उन को खत्म होना है । वह चाहे आज हो या १०० वर्ष के बाद हो । सभापति महोदय, दल बंदी भी रहे और न्याय भी रहे यह सम्भव बात नहीं । दलबन्दी रहेगी तो अन्याय होगा । न्याय कभी भी संम्भव नहीं हो सकता । और जहां न्याय नहीं वहां सुख और शांति की आशा नहीं । यह जो पद हैं वह तो हमारी ३५ करोड़ जनता के प्रतिनिधि हैं । यहां पर जो बैठते हैं उन का काम तो इतना कठिन है कि उन को हर समय ईमानदार रहना चाहिये । दिन भर । जितनी देर यहां बैठेंग उतनी देर । किस को बोलने का अवसर देना चाहिये किस को नहीं देना चाहिये यह भी उन को ही विचारना है । कोई बोल रहा है तो ठीक बोल रहा है या नहीं, यानी प्रति क्षण प्रति शब्द, प्रति वाक्य में उनको विचार करना है कि जो बातें यहां हो रही हैं वह न्याय युक्त बातें हो रही हैं या नहीं । इसलिये इस में कोई शक नहीं कि यह जो पद है बहुत ही अपूर्व महत्व रखता है और यहां पर बैठने वाला जो व्यक्ति हो वह देश का चुना हुआ हो और जिसकी ईमानदारी में शक व शुबह का स्थान न हो । ऐसे ही व्यक्ति को वहां जाना चाहिये ।

सभापति महोदय, मैं कहता हूं कि ऐसे आदमी के जाने पर भी उनसे गलतियां हो

सकती हैं और जो पार्टी मैन रहेंगे, उनका तो कहना ही क्या । सभापति महोदय, रामायण में एक पद है ।

दोउ न होंहि एक समय भुवालू
हंसिय ठठाय फुलाउव गालू ।

इस पद का अर्थ यह है कि रोना और हंसना एक साथ नहीं हो सकता। दोनों नहीं चल सकते कि हम ठठाकर हंसें भी और खूब रोवें भी । तो मेरा यह निवेदन है कि आपको इस तरह विचार करना होगा । एक पार्टी मैन, एक दल बंदी वाला आदमी और वह न्यायशील हो यह सम्भव नहीं है । इसको सोच लीजिये ।

श्री सी० के० नायर (वाह्य दिल्ली): आपका तजरबा क्या है ।

बाबू रामनारायण सिंह : वही तजरबा तो मैं कह रहा हूं । अभी उधर से बताया गया कि पुरुषोत्तम दास जी टंडन की नवाब छतारी ने कितनी प्रशंसा की । मैं ने उसी वक्त इंटरप्शन किया था कि दूसरे टंडन कहां हैं । सभापति जी, जो नियम होता है उसका अपवाद तो होता ही है । तो जो टंडन जी कांग्रेस मैन होते हुए भी इन्साफ कर सके, सत्य पर रह सके और ईमानदार रह सके यह तो इस नियम का अपवाद है । आप माफ कीजिये कुछ लोग हंसते भी हैं, कुछ तफरीह भी करते हैं, लेकिन यहां पर जो बातें होती हैं वह ३५ करोड़ भारतवासियों के भाग्य का निर्णय करती हैं। इस पर सोचना चाहिये। अगर दलबंदी के रूप में हंसी करना चाहें तो करें लेकिन इस से देश का भला होने को नहीं है । इस वास्ते, मैं तो जरूर कहूंगा कि इस पद पर वही आदमी होना चाहिये जो किसी दल से सम्बन्ध न रखता हो। मैं तो चाहता हूं कि देश में कोई दल न हो, किसी दल की सरकार न हो और मैं प्रत्येक भारतवासी से निवेदन करता हूं कि वह इस बात पर सोचे । कम से कम इस पद पर तो कोई ऐसा व्यक्ति न आवे जो किसी दल का हो । लेकिन यह तो होने को नहीं है । लेकिन अगर किसी दल का आदमी इस पद पर चुन कर आवे तो चुने जाने के बाद तो वह उस दल में न रहे, यह तो होना ही चाहिये । मेरा मतलब यह है कि वह किसी दल का आदमी नहीं होना चाहिए । ३६ करोड़ आदमियों का यह इतना बड़ा देश है । क्या कोई ऐसा आदमी नहीं हो सकता है जो कि किसी दल में न हो ? हो सकता है । सभापति महोदय, आप कहां तक न्याय कर सकेंगे । एक विषय आता है और उस पर दो घंटे बहस होगी । अब आप बताइये कि आप किस पार्टी को कितना वक्त देंगे । आप बात करते हैं ब्रिटिश हाउस आफ पार्लियामेंट की । वहां इस प्रकार बांट नहीं होती । वहां यह कितना सुन्दर नियम है कि जिस पर स्पीकर का दृष्टिपात हो उसको बोलने को कहा जाता है । यह कितनी सुन्दर परम्परा है कि जिस आदमी पर सब से पहले सभापति का दृष्टिपात हो वही आदमी बोलने का अधिकारी हो सकता है । तो आप ब्रिटिश परम्परा की तो बात करते हैं लेकिन मैं समझता हूं कि वहां इस तरह का बटवारा नहीं होता है । जो लोग खड़े होते हैं उनमें से जिस पर नजर पड़ती है वही बोलने का अधिकारी होता है । लेकिन यहां सभापति को व्हिप के हुक्म के मुताबिक सोचने विचारने की आवश्यकता होती है कि कौन से आदमी को बोलना चाहिये । जब तक इस तरह का बटवारा रहेगा न्याय नहीं होगा । विशेष कुछ मुझे कहना नहीं है ।

श्री सी० भट्ट (भड़ौच) : तो क्या आप की यह राय है कि चेयर पर कांस्टीट्यूशन की पुस्तक को रख दिया जाय ।

बाबू रामनारायण सिंह : यह लोग तो कांस्टीट्यूशन की बात करते हैं और बात करते हैं डिमाक्रेसी की । डिमाक्रेसी तो एक अंग्रेजी शब्द है । उसको आप हिन्दी में क्या कहोगे । अगर हम उसका उल्था हिन्दी में करें तो उसको पंचायती राज्य कहेंगे । और पंच को लोग इस देश में परमेश्वर कहते हैं । जो पंच होता है उसकी उपाधि परमेश्वर की होती है । लेकिन यह उपाधि उसी को मिल सकती है जो परमेश्वर की तरह निष्पक्ष हो, इम्पारशियल हो । हम जितने लोग यहां हैं वह सोचें कि जब त्रह निष्पक्ष होकर परमात्मा को साक्षी रख कर कोई बात बोलते हैं तो कितने मिनट तक, कितने घंटे तक परमात्मा की तरह निष्पक्ष होने का प्रयत्न करते हैं । तो हमारे देश में डिमाक्रेसी और पंचायती राज्य की चर्चा होती है । लेकिन पंचायती रज्य में हर किसी व्यक्ति को अगर किसी विषय पर बोलना है तो परमात्मा को साक्षी करके और निष्पक्ष होकर बोलना चाहिए । तो डिमाक्रेसी का नाम तो बहुत सुनाई देता है पर यहां पर कुछ डिमाक्रेसी की रूप रेखा नहीं दिखायी देती है । मुझे और अधिक नहीं कहना है । जितनी बातें यहां हो रही हैं यह सही हैं । अगर यह चीज किसी संशोधन में आकर पास हो जाय तो ठीक है कि इस पद पर वही आदमी होना चाहिये जिसका किसी तरह कि दलबन्दी से सम्बन्ध न हो और जिसकी ईमानदारी में किसी तरह का शक व शुबह न हो । यहां तो कहा जाता है कि स्पीकर का या डिप्टी स्पीकर का निर्णय हो गया है । वह तो मानना पडता है और मान लेते हैं । यह एक बात है । लेकिन निर्णय तो ऐसा होना चाहिये कि जिसमें किसी को शक वह शुबह हो ही नहीं । निर्णय इतना सुन्दर होना चाहिये कि निर्णय के प्रतिकूल बोलने का किसी को साहस ही न पड़े । लेकिन सभापति महोदय मैं फिर आप सब लोगों से कहता हूं कि इस तरह का निर्णय उसी आदमी से संम्भव हो सकता है जो किसी पक्ष का न हो ।

Shri Velayudhan (Quilon *cum* Mavelikkara—Reserved—Sch. Castes): I was wondering whether a Bill like this relating to the salary of the Speaker and the Deputy-Speaker requires a long discussion like this, especially when these two officers are considered as sacred, as far as this Parliament is concerned. But I must say that the controversy over this question that has risen both on this side, as well as the other, the official side, is almost inevitable, because of the way the parliamentary democratic system is being conducted in this House.

The responsibility of the Speaker as well as of the Deputy-Speaker in promoting the parliamentary system of Government is the greatest. Their responsibility in cultivating popular faith in democracy itself is not small. Judging from the conduct of the Speaker as well as of the Deputy-Speaker during the last four years, I must say it was commendable and we have laid the foundation for a parliamentary system of Government through the guidance of these two sacred offices. But then, there were lapses not only from one side but from the other side also as far as the working of democracy is concerned. The success of parliamentary democracy depends on both sides, a Responsible Opposition as well as a Responsive Treasury Bench. Unless and until this cardinal principle is brought into practice as an article of faith, I do not think Democracy will have, not only in this Parliament but in this country, a safe sailing or a successful future.

Judging from this point I must say that in other countries where parliamentary systems have developed to a high standard a Bill like this should not require a long time for discussion and decision. But judging from the standard in which we in this country are, and judging from the standard of the Parliament itself I must say that the Bill requires a little amount of

discussion and deliberation by the Members of this Parliament.

As far as the salary of the Speaker and the Deputy-Speaker is concerned, I think the matter should be judged not only from the point of dignity itself but it should be judged from the point of necessity also—not only the salary of the Speaker and the Deputy-Speaker but also of the Ministers as well as of the Members of Parliament. It is my firm opinion that the salary now laid down according to the provisions of this Bill to the Speaker and the Deputy-Speaker is not a very high salary, not from the point of dignity but from the point of necessity as well. The cost of living in Delhi perhaps is the highest in the world. That is what people say. A friend of mine came from New York a few months ago; he wanted to stay in New Delhi for a couple of weeks; but he had to cut short his programme of stay here because of the high cost of living he found in the city of New Delhi. It is not for joking that I was saying this. I have not seen anywhere else in India that if one wants to consult a doctor he will have to pay Rs. 62, for the consultation fee alone. And I have not seen anywhere else the doctors charging for medicines for a week, for a month and for two months. The system is barbarous. I can understand a doctor charging a particular amount for curing a disease; but this particular system I have not seen anywhere else. Regarding the cost of living in Delhi—food and other necessities of life—take for example the restaurants and the hotels in New Delhi and the amount they charge. I am told that no hotel in any big city in the country is charging amounts like that.

It is from this point of necessity that we have to decide the salary of the Speaker and the Deputy-Speaker or those people who are in responsibility. I am not ignoring at the same time the sufferings of the poor masses. They have not even a square meal for the day. Of course that is a problem which will have to be solved. But at the same time it does not mean that we should make the Speaker or the Deputy-Speaker to come to Parliament in a *tonga* or on a bicycle.

श्री के० के० बसु : (डायमण्ड हार्बर) पैदल जा सकते हैं ।

Shri Velayudhan: Tell it in English and I will answer.

In supporting this Bill I wish also to say that the responsibility of the Speaker and the Deputy-Speaker is the greatest in bringing about a kind of permanency to the system of parliamentary democracy in India.

With these words I support the Bill.

Shri Thanu Pillai (Tirunelveli): I was listening with attention to the speech of Mr. Punnoose when he made a reference to the Deputy-Speaker being a member of the executive of the Congress Party. In our experience in this House I may say with regard to the Communist Members and the Communist Party that we do not look at them as some other Communist members who might have been involved in some criminal cases elsewhere. We can differentiate between a Communist and a Communist Member of Parliament. We do not think that because one Member belongs to a particular party, here the Communist he is always out for the blood of others. Simply because the Deputy-Speaker happens to be in the executive of the Congress Party, when he occupies that office of Deputy-Speaker could they not understand that the person can rise above party level and give his judgment impartially? I doubt there is a sort of autobiographical touch on the part of the Opposition; we have in the Panel of Chairmen the hon. lady Member, and often she presides. We were under the impression that she was impartial and the balance of justice did not turn this way or that. But when a member of the Congress Party is in the Chair, having been elected to that august office for saving the honour of the country and the nation, of which the lady Member was so eloquent about, when she was speaking, questioning the honesty, the propriety of Deputy-Speaker being a member of the executive of the Congress Party we are moved to question here impartiality. She spoke so much about the executive whip. Have they ever seen whips being given to the Speaker or the Deputy-Speaker?

Shri Punnoose: How are we to know?

Shri Thanu Pillai: There again it is because their history is always that of implicit obedience to their party whips.

An Hon. Member: As a member of the executive has he no obligation?

Shri Thanu Pillai: So far as the Chairman is concerned there is none. Even for other things we have such liberty of speech, thought and action that whips cannot do anything. But I tell you it is also a historical phenomenon that they have got such a rigorous system of control and discipline that when it is doubted that a party man would go against the party, he is murdered.

Shri Nambiar (Mayuram): No.

Shri Thanu Pillai: Certainly. I challenge. There are cases I can

[**Shri Thanu Pillai**]

prove. They have been convicted for murder (*An Hon. Member*: Liquidated). I am sorry. In their language it is 'liquidation.'

Shri Nambiar: Question.

Shri Thanu Pillai: We can understand the fire coming from the other side on this Bill, and one Member on this side said 'the Deputy-Speaker is partial, he is against us'. It is not to be put that way. The Deputy-Speaker being a Congressman, a Gandhite and a democrat, though he has not given up the party affiliation, has so much of honesty, straightforwardness, gentlemanliness and the Indian *dharma* in him that he looks more to the left out of consideration that they are a minority and not to the right because they are our party men. We are proud of the Speaker for not having given more opportunities to our Members but having given more to the Members of the Opposition. If they could have challenged a Minister's salary, it is a different matter but when it is a question of the Speaker's salary whose impartial justice they have been enjoying and are enjoying now, then it is a question of the conduct of the Chair to a considerable extent. I would challenge them to prove one instance where our Speaker or Deputy-Speaker or for that matter even our Ministers have cared less for them, the Members of the Opposition than for us.

Shri Punnoose: May I ....

Mr. Chairman: So far as I am concerned, I will prevent any discussion about the personnel whether it be from this side or that side.

Shri Thanu Pillai: Personal references had been admitted.

Mr. Chairman: It will not be permitted so long as I am here.

Shri Thanu Pillai: A point has been raised that the Deputy-Speaker is a member of the Executive. Does this not refer to the hon. Member Mr. Ayyangar? Without naming that person, the Executive and the Chair have been linked. To that extent we have got a right to answer. We must have a discretion to answer.

Shri Punnoose: On a point of order, Sir.

Shri Thanu Pillai: There is no point of order in this.

Mr. Chairman: May I appeal to the hon. Member to avoid making references like this. So far as I could find, I will not take the reference made to his being a member of the Executive as personal. Of course he can reply to the point.

Shri Thanu Pillai: If a member of the Communist Party occupies that Chair, if she can be given the credit of doing justice by her party members, though they are not trained in that, they cannot tolerate on our side even this simple thing of the Speaker or the Deputy-Speaker being a member of the party. I would like to mention here that our Speaker, who just after the elections was elected by the whole House, by a majority vote, said that though in the execution of his duties, he would be fair and impartial, he would never be without his attachment to his party. He will always be a Congressman, all his lifetime. That was what he mentioned. He can rise above the party and be impartial.

About salaries, so much was said by the Opposition. My hon. friend, Mr. Nambiar, when it was suggested that the daily allowance of members should be reduced from Rs. 40 to Rs. 35 he brought an amendment to the effect that those who do not want to yield to that cut should be permitted to have Rs. 40. Some of those hon. Members drawing Rs. 40 a day are not willing to reduce it by Rs. 5. We must know that the salary of the Speaker and the Deputy-Speaker is not being enhanced. It is being reduced and brought to the level of the Ministers. Instead of appreciating the cut in their salaries, they say the salary of these officers is being increased. They say "Why should the Speaker get so much, why should the Deputy-Speaker get so much? Is this democracy? You preach austerity to us but are you practising it"? I ask the Communist Members "Are you throwing away this Rs. 40 or are you keeping it or giving it to others"?

(*Interruptions*).

Shri Nambiar *rose*—

Shri Thanu Pillai: He can reply when he speaks. He has got a right to reply.

Shri K. K. Basu: Is it a demand from the Chair?

(*Interruptions*).

Shri Thanu Pillai: We thought after that international,—what shall I say, —changeover or somersault,—the Russian Government has given, a changeover in the international set up in their approach to various problems we could expect something good from our hon. Members in the opposition, at least as far as the Speaker's salary Bill is concerned. **History repeats** itself. When we were fighting the battle of independence, they called it as imperialistic war and pooh-poohed that individual satyagraha. When they came round to the people's war for being the henchmen of British imperialism, it took them several months for a changeover. After the British Communist Party gave the changeover from imperialist war to people's war, it took them so much time to translate Russian to English and English to Indian languages. So, it is nothing new in their phenomenon. They are only repeating their old story when they speak of regeneration of India and the honour and prestige of our country. I request them as an Indian to Indian to build up India. Either we may be here, or if you are destined to be here some day, you are welcome, but do not spoil the country by putting everything obstructive, everything destructive. Think for a moment constructively and give your co-operation and do not stand in the way of the Speaker's or Deputy-Speaker's salary. If the challenge comes on a Bill or a cut motion or even on our Prime Minister's salary, we will meet it but this is a thing which should be taken as above party politics and I hope those hon. Members will hereafter at least give the co-operation.

12 NOON.

Shri Nambiar: On a point of personal explanation. A reference was made about me.

Mr. Chairman: I will give him a chance to speak.

Shri Nambiar *rose*—

Shri Punnoose: On a point of order, Sir. The hon. Member spoke about a certain amendment tabled by Shri Nambiar If the hon. Member Shri Nambiar wants a personal explanation to be made here and now.........

Mr. Chairman: I am going to give him an opportunity to speak.

Shri Nambiar: My explanation is very simple. I moved an amendment to the resolution about salaries and allowances of Members. My amendment was for cutting the allowance down from Rs. 40. I went to the extent of fixing the pay at something like Rs. 300 a month and Rs. 10 a day. That is what I remember to have done. I never said that it should be anything more than Rs. 40. He is misquoting the whole thing.

Shri Gidwani (Thana): I was surprised at the speech of the last speaker. To say the least I cannot understand his vehemence against the Opposition which was not referring to a particular individual or a particular party. It is a matter of principle whether the Deputy-Speaker should be associated actually with any organisation of which he is a Member. Today the Congress Party may be in power, tomorrow, some other party may come in power. We must look at this question objectively and impersonally. Therefore, it will be a wholesome principle if the Deputy-Speaker is not associated actively with the political organisation because according to the Constitution which was referred in this House, he has to discuss many things in the party itself and as a loyal member of that party, he has to carry out certain instructions. Therefore it is in the fitness of things that he should not be actively associated with the party.

I will again refer to the resolution which was read by comrade Punnoose —"The Executive Committee shall have power to examine all motions, amendments or Bills proposed to be made or introduced in the Parliament of India by any Member and to approve or modify or reject the same as they are in accordance with or contrary to the programme and policy of the Congress". Therefore, it is difficult for a person who is a member of the executive to get instructions from that executive in one day and decide impartially all questions which may not be according to the party programme. I think it is high time that we consider this problem absolutely objectively. In certain other countries I am told the Deputy-Speakers are always elected from the opposition parties. There is some sound principle involved in it. Let us not look at the question from any individual point of view. We may have personal respect or regard for the person occupying the Chair, whether he is the Speaker or the Deputy-Speaker. This is a matter of principle. So I would request the House to consider this from that point of view and give its support to this question.

The other thing that I want to say is this. In the Bill that has been proposed, it has been said that the salary of the Speaker and the Chairman is equated with that of the Cabinet Ministers. If that is so, I fail to see any reason why the salary of the Deputy-Speaker and the Deputy-Chairman is not equated to that of the Deputy Ministers. Why should there be any difference, particularly in regard to the salary of the Deputy

[Shri Gidwani]

Chairman of the Council of States? You are all aware that the Council of States has very little work to do. Apart from the number of months they meet—it may be 3 or 4 or 5 months in a year—even when they meet, sometimes full day's work is not there. Sometimes, they adjourn after one hour, sometimes after two hours. In fact, in that House, there is no need for a Deputy-Chairman. You should have only a Chairman and a panel of Chairmen. After all, the work there is very little. I would suggest that the salary of the Deputy Chairman should not be there. He should continue to draw the allowances that he is drawing at present. That would go to save some money. We need not go into the general question of economy or the reduction of salaries. But, it cannot be denied that even a pie saved in this way will help us to do something towards the relief of many problems which face the country today. It is from that point of view that I would appeal to the Law Minister to consider whether in the Council of States also, these two officers should continue and whether the Deputy Chairman of the Council of States should get the same salary as that of the Deputy Speaker of the House of People. This is a point worth considering. It is not a party question. We must not look at every question from the party point of view. It is a question of economy. It is a question of doing justice. It is not a question of prestige or dignity. I do not know how our Deputy Ministers feel when the Deputy-Speaker and the Deputy Chairman are being given a higher salary. But, then, that is a different matter. I would like to look at the question from an economic point of view. There is not enough work for the Deputy Chairman of the Council of States and he should not be given this high salary.

Apart from that, you are aware of my view that it is not necessary to continue the Council of States. Everybody knows that Upper Houses are not necessary. Even, as I understand, the Congress party has issued some kind of instructions and elicited opinion, on the question whether there should be Upper Houses. I am in favour of abolishing the Council of States and also the Upper Houses in the State legislatures as they do not serve any purpose. I say that there is not enough work for these two officers in the Council of States and that there is no need to give this high salary to the Deputy Chairman. In the case of the Chairman, he is not only the Chairman of the Council of States, but he is also the Vice-President of our Republic. He has sometimes to perform those duties. That is a different question. As regards the Deputy-Chairman, he should not at all be given a salary. With these words, I close my remarks.

श्री के० सी० सोधिया (सागर) सभापति महोदय, आज के भाषणों को सुनकर.......

Some Hon. Members: English.

Shri K. C. Sodhia: I am quite satisfied with this Bill after hearing the various speeches made. It is a question of principle. I must clear the wrong notions that have been expressed while dealing with this Bill.

We are all for levelling down the distinctions between the classes. It is the main aim of the Congress party. Our Communist friends and other gentlemen also want to do the same thing. But, their action is not in consonance with their professions. There are two ways of levelling things. One is that people who are sitting there should come down and be here; another way is that people who are standing here should take up ladders and go up. Our way of levelling, as far as I can understand, is that the common man in this country ought to be elevated from his present degraded position and should be placed in a better position. We are trying to increase by all means the average earnings of the poor in this country.

Shri K. K. Basu: And you start with the Speaker and the Deputy-Speaker.

Shri K. C. Sodhia: I am coming to that.

It is said that the Speaker and the Deputy-Speaker ought not to belong to any party. My hon. friend Babu Ram Narayan Singh said that there should be no party politics and that there should be no difference of opinion. Well, I cannot conceive of a time when this human society will have no difference of opinion on any question. We are going to reach a stage when there will be differences, and acute differences, regarding policy and procedure. I cannot conceive of a time when party rule would be eliminated from our Parliament, and our administration. It was said that the Speaker and the Deputy-Speaker ought not to belong to any party. I do not know whether these people feel that they should have no political opinion altogether.

If that is their proposition, then, they will have to go to the skies to find out people to occupy this Chair. I say that belonging to a party and discharging the duties of these posts in a manner which is desirable and proper, is quite possible. I was glad to hear from my hon. friend Babu Ram Narayan Singh that at least Shri Purushottam Das Tandon discharged that duty in the best possible way. There can be no one exception. Those who say that there is only one exception to the rule, have not seen the whole thing. I say it is quite possible to discharge the duties of the positions of Speaker and Deputy-Speaker without resigning from the party to which they belong. I am not much enamoured about cutting the trappings and caps, as was said by an hon. Lady Member from the opposite side. It depends upon the persons who occupy this Chair, whether they want to discharge their duties in the proper way or not. From my experience of the short time that I have been here, I can say that our Speaker and Deputy-Speaker have done the job in the most faultless and most praiseworthy way.

As regards the question of pay and other amenities, in these days of rising expediture, I do not know whether any thing less than what has been proposed in the Bill could keep these dignitaries in the position in which they ought to be placed. There may be some difference of about Rs. 100 or 200 here or there. That does not matter much. We should not grudge the salary that is given to a person. We should rather be careful about the way in which he discharges his work, as to how he performs his work. Even if he requires a little more salary, we should not grudge that; we should be glad to give it. Therefore on a matter of principle, I do not find anything that comes in the way of my subscribing wholeheartedly to the Bill before us and I support the Motion wholeheartedly.

Mr. Chairman: Now, on the Agenda there is the one-hour discussion regarding the new International Wheat Agreement for the supply of wheat at 2·05 dollars per bushel.

RENEWED INTERNATIONAL WHEAT AGREEMENT

Mr. Chairman: Those that had given notice of moving for this discussion are:

Shri Tribhuan Narayan Singh,
Shri Radha Raman,
Shri Shree Narayan Das,
Pandit Munishwar Dutt Upadhyay,
Shrimati Indira A. Maydeo, and
Shri Bhagwat Jha "Azad".

Besides, I think, about four or five other Members may like to participate. And this is only one hour's discussion, and after that discussion the hon. Minister, I understand, is likely to take about 15 to 20 minutes. Therefore, I would fix the time as ten minutes for those who have given notice of this motion and five minutes for others.

श्री राधा रमण (दिल्ली नगर): सभापति जी जिस सम्बन्ध में आपने इस सदन के सदस्यों को अपने विचार प्रकट करने के लिये एक घंटा दिया है वह विषय काफी महत्व का है । और मैं आपका विशेष रूप से धन्यवाद करता हूं कि जहां हमने यह ख्वाहिश जाहिर की थी कि हमको इस विषय पर आध घंटे के डिसकशन का समय दिया जाय, आपने एक घंटे का समय दिया । इससे यह जाहिर होता है कि इस विषय का महत्व कितना है और देशवासी आज कल इस विषय पर कितनी चर्चा करते हैं ।

मैं सबसे पहले आपका ध्यान इस विषय पर आकर्षित करूंगा कि अखबारों के जरिये मालूम हुआ है कि एक समझौता गेहूं के सम्बन्ध में हमारे मंत्री जी ने उन सरकारों से किया है कि जो गेहूं ऐक्सपोर्ट (निर्यात) करती हैं । अभी उस समझौते की सारी शर्तें हमारे सामने नहीं हैं । लेकिन इस चीज का हमें पता लगा है कि उस समझौते पर गालिबन आज दस्तखत हो चुके हैं ।

The Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri Kidwai): May I interrupt the hon. Member? Mr. T. N. Singh had asked us for certain information, and we have sent him a full copy of the Agreement. If the other Members are not aware of it, then I am sorry. We had one copy, and we sent it.

Some Hon. Members: We could not hear.

Mr. Chairman: The position is this, that the hon. Member who was speaking said that he is not in possession of a copy of the Agreement. The hon. Minister says that Mr. T. N. Singh whose name appears first in the list of those who had asked for the discussion, was supplied with a copy of the terms of the Agreement.

Shri K. K. Basu (Diamond Harbour): For collective use?

Shri Kidwai: Yes, for collective use.

Mr. Chairman: Let the hon. Member proceed.

Shri V. B. Gandhi (Bombay City—North): Will the hon. Minister give us the terms in brief so that the discussion may be helped.

Shri Kidwai: It is a very long document, and one does not know in what portion a particular Member is interested.

Shri Punnoose (Alleppey): It is not a particular Member. It is the whole House that is interested in the loss that we have to sustain.

Shri. V. B. Gandhi: Is there a minimum price provision there?

Shri Kidwai: In a few minutes, I may say what the Agreement is. When the International Wheat Agreement was entered into last time, *i.e.* four years ago, the maximum price was fixed at 1·80 dollar per bushel, and the minimum prices—because it was generally expected that prices would come down—as follows:

1·50 dollars in the first year,
1·40 dollars in the second year,
1·30 dollars in the third year, and
1·20 dollars in the fourth year.

But the prices always remained high, *i.e.*, the exporting countries had to subsidise our imports. The rule was that if the prices ranged between the minimum and maximum, then we will get at the market prices. If the prices were higher than the maximum, then the exporting countries would pay the difference. We were allowed to purchase in the open market, but we would pay only 1·80 dollars per bushel, and whatever excess there was would be met by the exporting country. If the prices went down below the minimum, then we will have to purchase at the minimum price fixed. Last time we entered into an agreement it was generally thought that the prices would come down below the minimum. Therefore, minimum prices were regulated as 1·50 dollars in the first year, 1·40 dollars in the second year, 1·30 dollars in the third year and 1·20 dollars in the fourth year. There was a similar experience. At one time Burma Government had offered us rice at very favourable rates, but then they had stipulated a certain price. That price was very favourable, but our advisers thought that these high prices would not be maintained for long. Therefore, we refused to enter into an agreement, and we have had to pay a high price. Similarly, today the market price in the U.S.A. is 2·28 dollars. In Canada, it is about 2.15 dollars. We are required to pay the maximum price of 2·05 dollars. Last time when we entered into an agreement, the maximum was 1.80 dollars, and over and above that, we were asked to pay .06 dollars per bushel for their storage and other purposes because they had guaranteed to supply. This year, the maximum includes all the other charges. Therefore, it is an increase of 0.19 dollars, which is cheaper than the present market price, and whenever the market price goes down from the maximum, then we are required to pay only the market price, except when it comes down below the minimum price. Then, of course, we will suffer.

Shri V. B. Gandhi: What is the minimum price in this agreement?

Shri Kidwai: 1.55 dollars.

Shri Sarmah (Goalghat-Jorhat): What is the maximum?

Shri Kidwai: 2.05 dollars.

Shri Jhunjhunwala (Bhagalpur-Central): We are not bound to pay at 2.05 dollars?

Shri Kidwai: We will purchase at the market rate. We are today purchasing at the market price, but because the market price is high, the Governments of the exporting countries pay the difference. Similarly, if the market price goes below the minimum, then we will have to pay the minimum price. That is the agreement.

Shri Punnoose: On a point of clarification, Sir.

Mr. Chairman: If the whole time is spent in this way, the Members may not get an opportunity to speak. The basis has been given by him.

श्री राधा रमण : सभापति जी मुझे खुशी है कि चन्द बातों पर, जो हमारी आज की बहस में फायदेमन्द साबित हो सकती हैं, हमारे मिनिस्टर साहब ने रोशनी डाली है । मगर इस वक्त जो हमारे दिमागों में इस समझौते के विषय में कुछ शंकायें हैं उन पर पूरे तौर पर रोशनी पड़ना जरूरी है। यह बात अभी बताई गयी कि हिन्दुस्तान ने जो समझौता इस गेहूं की खरीदारी के लिये किया है उस को दुनिया के बाजार में जो आम गेहूं की कीमत चल रही है उसके मुताबिक कम से कम और ज्यादा से ज्यादा कीमत को ध्यान में रख कर किया गया है । संसद् के सभी सदस्यों को यह ज्ञात है कि इस सम्बन्ध में पहला समझौता सन् १९४९ में हुआ था। और वह चार साल के लिये हुआ था । मिनिस्टर साहब ने यह भी बताया है कि इन पिछले चार सालों में गेहूं की कीमत किस तरह रखी गई और हिन्दुस्तान ने किन भावों से वह गेहूं खरीदा आज जब हम दोबारा यह समझौता कर रहे हैं तो हम को कुछ अपने देश की सियति की ओर ध्यान करना पड़ता है । पहली बात यह बतायी गयी कि आज अमरीका और कनाडा के बाजार में गेहूं का भाव कुछ ज्यादा है । इस सम्बन्ध में मैं यह अर्ज करना चाहता हूं कि जब से इस समझौते के दोबारा होने की चर्चा चली है उसी समय से गेहूं के भाव उन मुल्कों में बढ़ने शुरू हुए और . . . .

श्री किदवई : जब से बातचीत शुरू हुई तब से दाम कुछ घटे हैं ।

श्री राधा रमण : माफ कीजिये । मुझे मिनिस्टर साहब ने सही कर दिया । हो सकता है कि यह बात ठीक हो और मुझे यह मान लेनी चाहिए । तो मैं यह अर्ज कर रहा था कि सन् १९४९ में जब हमने गेहूं की खरीदारी का समझौता किया था हमें यह मालूम है कि उस समय हमारे मुल्क की गेहूं के स्टाक की स्थिति कैसी थी और उस वक्त हम कितने मजबूर थे कि हम गेहूं के समझौते में शामिल हों । ताकि हमारे मुल्क की जो खाद्य समस्या है वह कुछ हद तक हल हो । मगर अब अगर हम उन पिछले बयानों को देखें कि जो हमारे खाद्य मंत्री और उनके सहकारी मंत्रियों ने दिये हैं तो हमें इस बात का संतोष होगा कि पिछले चार सालों में हमारी खाद्य समस्या बहुत काफी हल हुई है । यह हमारे मंत्री जी के परिश्रम, उनकी सूझबूझ और उनकी नीति का नतीजा है कि आज हम अपने मुल्क की गेहूं की समस्या को बहुत कुछ सुलझा हुआ पाते हैं : इसके लिए हमारे मंत्रीगण बहुत बधाई के पात्र हैं । हम यह देख रहे हैं कि हमारी जो चार साल पहल की गेहूं की समस्या थी वह अब काफी सुलझती जा रही है और हमको इस बात का काफी विश्वास है कि जिस नीति को हमारे सर्वप्रिय मंत्री जी ने अपने आफिस में आने के बाद मुल्क में चलाया है उस से बहुत काफी संतोष हुआ है और लोगों को बहुत काफी शांति भी मिली है । ऐसी अवस्था में जब हम चार साल के कड़े प्रयत्न और परिश्रम के बाद एक नये तीन साल के लिये समझौता करने जा रहे हैं तो यह बात सोचना और विचारना जरूरी हो जाता है कि जब दुनिया के मारकेट में आज गेहूं का भाव एक डालर और ८० सेंट आम तौर पर समझा जाता है और जब कि खास तौर से इंगलैंड जैसा देश इस समझौते में शामिल होने को तैयार नहीं है और उसने हमारे सामने यह रखा था कि अमरीका और ऐक्सपोर्टिंग कंट्रीज (निर्यातक देश) ज्यादा से ज्यादा दो डालर प्रति बुशल गेहूं के दाम चार्ज करें तो ऐसी कौन सी तकलीफ आ गयी थी कि हिन्दुस्तान ने अमरीका के

[श्री राधा रमण]

२.०५ डालर की दर को मंजूर किया। यह बात सोचने की है और हम जानना चाहते हैं कि जब हमारे देश की समस्या दिनों दिन सुलझती जा रही है और जब कि आज हमारे देश में सन् १९४९ के मुकाबले में गेहूं की स्थिति बहुत सुधर गयी है। तब ऐसी सूरत मे हम किसी समझौते को करने में क्यों इतनी जल्दी करें। सन् १९४९ में जो समझौता हुआ था उसमें गेहूं के इम्पोर्ट करने वाले, खरीदने वाले, क़रीब ४६ मुल्क थे और इस समझौते में करीब ३६ मुल्क शामिल समझे जाते हैं, जिन में हिन्दुस्तान भी एक है। इंग्लैंड ने इस समझौते पर अपने हस्ताक्षर करने से इन्कार किया और यह जानते हुए कि इंगलैंड को गेहूं की कितनी ज्यादा ज़रूरत है। सारी दुनिया में जितने गेहूं की उपज बाहरी मुल्कों के लिये रहती है उस में से ३०वां हिस्सा इंग्लैंड खर्च करता है और हिन्दुस्तान सिर्फ उसका १०वां हिस्सा लेता है। इंग्लैंड एक ऐसा देश है जहां कि उस की तमाम गेहूं की खपत बाहर से ही गेहूं खरीद कर पूरी होती है और हमारे मुल्क में गेहूं का बहुत बड़ा हिस्सा हम अपने आप पैदा कर लेते हैं। तो एक ऐसा मुल्क जब इस बात की कोशिश कर रहा था कि उस गेहूं की कीमत जो बाहर भेजा जाता है कुछ कम ही जाय और कम कीमत पर उस को गेहूं प्राप्त हो तो हिन्दुस्तान जैसे मुल्क को क्या ऐसी जरूरत पड़ी थी कि उस ने ५ सैंट ज्यादा दे कर समझौते पर हस्ताक्षर किए। यह बात जरा जानने की है।

दूसरे हम यहां पर यह अच्छी तरह से जानते हैं कि न सिर्फ हमारे हिन्दुस्तान में गेहूं की उपज बढ़ रही है बल्कि जितने भी पश्चिमी देश (मग़रिबी मुमालिक) हैं इन सब की रिपोर्ट और इन की उपज को देखने से मालूम होता है कि वहां इस साल गेहूं, की उपज और सालों से कहीं ज्यादा है और जो उनकी खरीदने की ज़रूरत है वह भी कुछ कम हो गयी है। तो ऐसी सूरत में जब कि उन मुल्कों की उपज ज्यादा है और उनकी जरूरत भी पहले से कुछ कम है, हमारी समझ में यह चीज नहीं आती कि इस की क्या ज़रूरत महसूस हुई कि हम इस मैग्जिमम प्राइस (ज्यादा से ज्यादा दर) को जो घट सकती थी या, जिसके बारे में हम देशों को मजबूर कर सकते थे कि वह कम कीमत को मंज़ूर कर लें, मंज़ूर करें और हम जानते हैं कि ऐसे मुल्क हमारी ज़रूरत को महसूस करके कीमत को कुछ बढ़ा देते हैं और ऐसी कीमतें लेते हैं कि जिनको हम गैर मुनासिब कह सकते हैं। अगर फ़्री मारकेट हो, यानी दुनिया के अन्दर जो गेहूं पैदा होता है उस की खरीद और बिक्री अगर व्यौपारी लोगों के हाथ में रखी जाय तो यह मानी हुई बात है कि जो कीमत हम दे रहे हैं उस से कुछ कम क़ीमत पर हम को गेहूं मिल सकता है, तो ऐसी सूरत में यह एक चीज ऐसी है कि जो हमारे दिमागों में फिर रही है। इस से यह न समझा जाय कि हम गवर्नमेंट के काम की, जो उस ने समझ बूझ कर किया है यानी समझौते पर हस्ताक्षर किये हैं अवहेलना करना चाहते हैं। लेकिन हम जानना चाहते हैं कि क्या कारण है कि ऐसे मुल्क ने कि जिस की तमाम ज़रूरत दूसरे मुल्क पैदा करते हैं और जो हमारे से ज्यादा मुसीबत में पड़ सकता है, समझौते पर हस्ताक्षर नहीं किये और हमने क्यों किये और जब हमारे मुल्क की हालत सुधरी हुई है और अपनी उपज के बिना पर हम अपने को ज्यादा सुरक्षित पात हैं, तो हमें क्या ऐसी जरूरत है कि हम एक ऐसे समझौते में पड़ने की जल्दी

करें जब कि और भी मुल्क इस में अभी शामिल नहीं हैं ।

एक चीज में और अर्ज करना चाहता हूं कि पिछले दिनों में जब यह समझौता हुआ था उस वक्त जिन ऐक्सपोर्टिंग कंट्रीज ने उस के ऊपर दस्तखत किये थे उन में रूस और अरजेंटाइना, यह दोनो मुल्क नहीं थे जिनके यहां गेहूं की आमदनी काफी है और जिन से हम गेहूं खरीद सकते हैं । हिन्दुस्तान ने पिछले वक्त में कुछ गेहूं रशिया से खरीदा भी था और वह अमरीका से सस्ता खरीदा था ।

श्री किदवई : यह ग़लत है ।

श्री राधा रमण : अच्छा, "आई स्टैंड करैक्टैड" ।(मैं गलती मानता हूं) तो ऐसी सूरत में जब कि यह दो मुल्क गेहूं की उपज रखते हैं और उन से खरीद भी सस्ती की जा सकती है तो यह बात समझ में नहीं आती कि हमने इतने बड़े समय के लिये, तीन साल के वक्फ़े के लिये इस समझौते को मान कर अपने आप को ऐसी स्थिति में क्यों डाल लिया कि जहां हम को गेहूं मंहगा खरीदना पड़ेगा विशेषकर जब कि हम को उम्मीद हो सकती थी कि हम सस्ता गेहूं खरीद सकते ।

तो मैं यह बातें संसद् के सामने इस ख्याल से रखता हूं कि हिन्दुस्तानियों के दिमाग़ में इस की काफ़ी चर्चा है और इस के मुतल्लिक काफ़ी शंका उन के दिमाग़ों में है जिन के लिये हम यह जरूरी समझते हैं कि मंत्री साहब इन की सफ़ाई कर दें और हमारे दिमाग़ों में जो शंकायें हैं उन्हें दूर कर दें । इन सब्दों के साथ मैं इस समझौते के मुताल्लिक जो ख्याल था वह आप के सामने रखता हूं और आशा करता हूं कि मंत्री जी इस पर रोशनी डालेंगे ।

Shri S. N. Das (Darbhanga Central): For the last two or three months negotiations have been going on between the exporting and importing countries on the question of the renewal of this International Wheat Agreement. It appears that 17 Governments have signed the agreement, while others including the Government of the United Kingdom which is the largest importing country that has participated in these negotiations, have been insisting that the price of wheat under this agreement should not be higher than two dollars per bushel. India has also been fighting for this, and insisting on this price, along with U.K. and other countries. From the papers, it appeared that this agreement would not be renewed, and that there was a breakdown.

[MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

I do not know whether the international food situations, and the stocks held by the different exporting countries, and the food prospects for the coming year would justify the renewal of this agreement. As a layman, I feel that India also is not in the position in which she was in 1949 and subsequent years. Our food situation has improved. From the statements made by the Food Ministers, from time to time, it appears that the stock position in our country is satisfactory as also the production of foodgrains. Therefore, we thought that India should fight for a lesser price. But abruptly we came to know that India has signed the agreement while U.K. has not. In view of the fact that U.K. is the largest importing country among the participating countries—importing 30 per cent. of the total pool—we thought, rather everyone thought..

Shri Kidwai: Not everyone.

Shri S. N. Das: May be. But there is a feeling in the country, Sir, that there was no necessity at present....

Shri Kidwai: That is not the feeling.

Shri S. N. Das: .... for this agreement. Hon. Members of this Parliament would have liked that before concluding this agreement, they should have been consulted and the position cleared by the hon. the Food Minister. We the Members of Parliament have no impression as to what were the internal and external conditions, what were the prices prevailing in the international wheat market, and we do not know the reasons which impelled the Government of India to leave the Government of the U.K....

Shri Kidwai: In the lurch.

Shri S. N. Das: .... and sign this agreement. So far as we know, in international matters, at least in economic matters, we have been just siding with the Government of the U.K. I think, any importing country would like that the price of wheat should be decreased. America which is the largest exporter,—the impression goes,—has compelled other importing countries or rather brought some pressure to bear upon them to agree to this price. As far as we know the production this year in the exporting countries as well as in the Western European countries has increased, and the European countries which were importing from America would import less this year. They are not going to import the quantity which they imported during the last two years. And we ourselves also are not going to import more than 1.5 million tons. In view of all these facts, the Government should not have been in a hurry to just sign this pact. Therefore, I would like to take this opportunity to request our Food Minister to enlighten this House regarding the reasons which impelled the Government of India to enter into this international wheat agreement and the extent to which we are going to import during these three years.

From the agreement it appears that it depends upon the importing countries to import, but we have to guarantee certain quantities of import. If we demand certain quantities of wheat from the international pool, we have to pay the maximum price. If there is no demand in our country, the exporting countries will compel us to buy certain quantities of wheat at the maximum price.

The Minister of Agriculture (Dr. **P. S. Deshmukh**): Minimum.

Shri S. N. Das: In view of the fluctuating prices and in view of the recession that is going on in our economic situation, I think it would have been better if the Government had not signed this agreement. That is my opinion. I would like to be enlightened by the hon. Minister. I would not take long, but just state that there is a feeling in this country, and it has also been expressed in certain newspapers, that the stand taken by the Government of the U.K. is more reasonable than the stand taken by the Government of India. I hope the hon. the Food Minister will make a statement and clarify the situation and remove these misapprehensions as to the loss that the signing of this pact contails.

Shri Punnoose *rose—*

Shri Kidwai: Sir, I have now only 20 minutes.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It will go up to 1-15. I will call the Minister at 1 o'clock.

Shri Kidwai: It will be too short.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Then five minutes more. Mr. Punnoose.

Shri Punnoose: Very disquieting news has been appearing in the papers, as for instance in the *Hindustan Standard* of 24th April, 1953, that our country will have to bear a loss of 9 crores of rupees by this bargain. At a time when Britain, which is related to America in several ways, is keeping out of the bargain and offering only Rs. 9-8-0 per bushel while America demands Rs. 10, India has straightway walked into the trap. I would like to know how and why these 9 crores of rupees we have to lose in this bargain.

Then again, the existing wheat agreement was signed by 46 countries, while only 24 countries have joined the new agreement so far.

Shri K. K. Basu: 17.

Shri Punnoose: Some papers say 24. The reason is simple. The exporting countries have produced double the quantity they produced last year. So Government of India could have waited a bit and bargained. But I think they sometimes forget what type of people they are dealing with on the other side. Now, it is not too late, I hope because this agreement cannot be binding unless it is ratified by Government of India.

Shri Kidwai: That is correct.

Shri Punnoose: So we have to stand up and show them that we also have got some kind of backbone. This is the time for that.

Shri K. K. Basu: With regard to what the Minister said in his interruption, I would like to know whether the actual price went down to the minimum level and the exporting countries had to pay for it in the last four years.

Shri Kidwai: Again there is some misapprehension.

Shri K. K. Basu: The Minister wanted to justify the position—if there is a likelihood of the thing coming down and the exporting countries having to pay for it, I would like to know on how many occasions in the last four years the exporting countries had to pay.

Shri Kidwai: The question has been perverted. Therefore, I will not answer it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Let him finish.

Shri K. K. Basu: The other point —this has already been referred to by previous speakers—is whether in view of the abundance of production, as revealed by statistics given by many economic journals, the Government has ascertained the internal market price in the major exporting countries and also in the other countries outside this pool, and whether Government has tried to go to other markets, apart from these American-dominated exporting countries.

Then another point which has come out in the papers and which the Minister wanted to justify was that these 6 cents. which used to be paid for storage, etc. was now going to be included. But one of the conditions is that there should be immediate delivery. Is there any time-limit within which to arrange for shipping, because in view of this 'immediate' delivery clause we might be asked to pay for damages. Then about the total loss, some papers say it will be 9 crores and some say it will be 7 or 8 crores. I would like to know what the Government expect will be the loss in view of the enhanced price. I would also like to know who are the new participating countries and the period for which we are going to bind ourselves under this international wheat agreement. These are the points I would like the Minister to answer.

Shri Damodara Menon (Kozhikode): I would like the hon. Minister to answer one or two questions. When the hon. Member Mr. Basu put a question, the hon. Minister said that it was perverted. So I would put it in another way.

Shri Kidwai: Yes. I hope it will not be perverted.

Shri Damodara Menon: The hon. Minister stated in his explanation that we have fixed a minimum in that agreement and when the price went below the minimum, the importing countries were to pay the price at the minimum rate.

Shri Kidwai: That is true.

Shri Damodara Menon: That means that they have to make good the difference and that was a loss. I would like the hon. Minister to give me some idea as to the loss we sustained as a result of making good this difference.

Shri Kidwai: In the last four years?

Shri Damodara Menon: No, not in the last four years.

Shri Kidwai: I do not think we suffered any loss.

Shri Damodara Menon: The hon. Minister said that especially last year the prices went down below the minimum.

Shri Kidwai: Last year? No; I said that it remained always above the maximum and therefore we were always gainers.

Shri K. K. Basu: Let us know the gain or loss we had.

Shri Damodara Menon: Regarding the minimum price, there were occasions....

Shri Kidwai: No; up to now there were no such occasions.

Shri Damodara Menon: I want the hon. Minister to tell me what were the reasons that weighed with the Government of U.K. to keep out of this agreement now.

Shri Kidwai: Anybody may try his guess and I will try mine.

Shri Damodara Menon: Is there any prospect of the price of wheat going down in the market now because most of the countries are producing more and the prospect of war is receding? Did the Government of India try other markets? Where was the hurry for the Government of India to enter into this agreement?

Shri V. B. Gandhi: I was one of the signatories to this requisition. Now, I see that we would have done better to have postponed this debate by a few days because today, I understand, happens to be the last day on which it is possible yet for Great Britain to decide whether or not to affix its signature to the International Wheat Agreement. And, therefore, the present debate is going to appear somewhat unreal, for after all, what is the debate based on? Now, Great Britain refuses to accept the price of 2 dollars and 5 cents per bushel. Supposing, Great Britain had accepted the price of 2 dollars and 5 cents, we all would probably have come to the conclusion that that was the right price to pay and this debate would never have come.

Shri Kidwai: That is correct.

Shri A. M. Thomas (Ernakulam): Then the question of Anglo-American bloc will arise.

Shri V. B. Gandhi: Now I want to begin by saying that I whole-heartedly support the stand taken by our Government and that for two reasons. For one reason because I do not believe that we are really having a bad bargain and we certainly do not want to join Great Britain if Great Britain wants to take a gamble.

Shri Kidwai: Yes.

Shri V. B. Gandhi: The second reason for which I support the stand taken by the Government is that they are supporting the idea of international agreements on commodities. This is the first big international experiment in the history of the world. The last agreement was a result of 7 international conferences and I am very glad that nothing is being done to harm this experiment and this experiment is going to be continued.

Now I come to the question raised by Mr. Basu. Mr. Basu wanted to know how much we lost or gained out of the last agreement. We actually gained, taking an average of our purchases as 1½ million bushels a year for the last 4 years at one dollar and 80 cents, and the average price during all these four years was always about 2 dollars and 10 cents —it sometimes reached $2·20—and as the hon. Minister says, it is today $2·28—but even taking it as $2·10, every year about 4 lakhs dollars, that is, practically 20 lakhs of rupees for the last 4 years.

Shri Kidwai: Ten times.

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh: Four crores of rupees.

Shri V. B. Gandhi: That is really the position. Something is said about abundance of supply.

If this abundance theory is really worth entertaining, then how can we reconcile the fact that even Great Britain is willing to pay 20 cents more per bushel? It is going to pay 20 cents and that itself should make us think how far there is truth in this abundance of supply theory. Now, what are the real facts? This abundance is more superficial than real. Last year's exportable surplus produced in the exporting countries was 66 milllion bushels, and the current year's is expected to be of the order of 46 million bushels, that is to say, a decline of 20 million bushels. The position may be very nearly what it was last year, because of the fact that at the end of the current year we shall have a stock of 34 million bushels as compared to 16 million bushels stock last year. So, the position may be very nearly what it was last year, but certainly it is not a position of any great extra-abundance.

For all these reasons, I wholeheartedly support the stand taken by our Government.

Shri T. K. Chaudhuri (Berhampore): I am hardly impressed by Britain not signing the agreement and I would not be impressed if Britain decides to sign the agreement today, because of the fact that Britain has in either case her own axe to grind. The House might know—or, it may not also know—that this price of 2 dollar and 5 cents has been the result of the Farm Support Programme of the United States Government and Britain wants the United States in return to consider favourably the Sterling Area support programmes for rubber, cocoa and other things. Thus, there is a bargaining tug-of-war going on between Britain and America. Our query to the Government is whether they have made an assessment of the international stock position before they agreed to the higher price demanded by U.S.A. I am not very much impressed by the figures just now cited by Dr. Gandhi. I have other figures with me. The international stock position in 1952-53 in the four exporting countries of the world, *viz.* the U.K., Australia, Canada and Argentina—of course, Argentina was not in the international wheat agreement—was 16 million tons. This year, up to June it is expected to be 34 million tons. In June 1954, it is expected that it would be 30 million tons. This stock position can be ascertained authoritatively. The hon. Minister has avenues to ascertain it. In view of this stock position, I want to know whether Government have made a proper assessment thereof and whether they have utilised our position as one of the principal buyers in the world market in having a voice in fixing the world wheat agreement prices irrespective of the Farm Support Prices of the United States or the bargaining position taken up by Britain. Have we moved independently and ascertained prices from other countries which are not in the agreement, say, Argentina, Russia or China? If we have done all this, I would be satisfied.

श्री घिमारिया (महेन्द्रगढ़) मेरा सवाल सिर्फ इतना है कि क्या कोई क्वालिटि का स्पेसिफ़िकेशन भी कायम किया गया है क्योंकि

अब तक का तजुर्बा यह है कि वहां से चाहे कैसा ही चलता हो यहां पर कन्जूमर्स के पास कूड़ा ही पहुंचता है।

Shri Kidwai: I think that some of the Members who have taken part in the discussion are not well aware of the conditions under which wheat has been purchased. Earlier, when explaining the terms of the agreement, I had stated that once the Burma Government had offered us rice on very, very favourable terms, and the price would not have been half of what we are paying today. But they wanted a long-term agreement—an agreement for about six or seven years. Our experts who smell something in everything heard that the price of rice was going down and so they advised, "Why should we commit ourselves for this seven year period?" The prices that we have been paying now show how mistaken our experts were.

Since this Conference for reviewing the Wheat Agreement started in England last year we and Britain have been working in complete agreement. We resisted every attempt of the exporting countries to raise the price so much so that the London Conference was abandoned. Then the Conference re-assembled and again we and Britain started working in complete agreement and worked so till the Conference reached a decision. It reached a decision that the exporting countries will fix the maximum price at 2·05 dollars. Then we parted. I think hon. Members must have noticed that only seventeen countries at first signed the agreement, and that neither Britain nor India did it. One news agency also reported from Washington that India and Britain were not signing the agreement. But we considered the pros and cons of this matter here and thought it would be advantageous to sign the agreement.

Since the Conservative Government came into power in Britain, they are giving up all the State trading and passing their trade to private merchants. They are withdrawing all the subsidies and though I have no means of knowing it, my guess is that they are going to leave the wheat trade also to private merchants. Therefore they have not entered into this Agreement.

Now I have got the open market prices of the last four years during which this Agreement has been in operation. The minimum price in 1950 was 2·17 dollars. That was the minimum price of the new crop in 1950 and according to quality the price was higher. The highest was I think 2·34 dollars. According to this Agreement, the quantities we had agreed to, were purchased at 1·80 dollars and whatever difference there was was paid in the United States by the United States Government. At that time also people thought that prices would come down; therefore, the minimum price was brought down from 1·50 dollars to 1·20 dollars. But what do we find? Next year the minimum price at which wheat was available was 2·26 dollars, that is a rise of 9 cents. Therefore we were gainers. Next year, that is in 1952 the minimum price was 2·34 dollars, which is a further rise. This year, that is in 1952-53 the minimum price at which it was available was 2·44 dollars. In spite of the accumulating stocks we would have paid higher and higher prices every year, but for this Agreement. This agreement entitled us to pay the maximum prices according to the agreement, that is 1·80 dollars and the balance was paid by the Governments of the exporting countries.

1 P.M.

We must in this connection remember that the United States has got a policy of price support. Whatever be the lowest price the United States Government will pay to the wheat producer 2·21 dollars. So long as that price support is there these high prices will continue, because nobody there will sell at a lower price than the price paid to the producer. The price support is to continue for another two years. Therefore, in the next two years there is no likelihood of the prices coming down. It is true that the United Kingdom has not entered into the Agreement. The United Kingdom was the highest consumer, but the wheat consumption will continue. If U.K. will not purchase according to this agreement then the U.K. merchants will purchase it in the open market. So long as U.S.A. which is the largest producer, has this price support policy that price will continue. This is the main reason why, although we did not sign the agreement on the opening day, we considered it and decided here to sign it. It is still said that we may not ratify it. It is open to us. But I have not heard anything in this House which could lead us to hope that we can get it elsewhere at cheaper rates.

[Shri Kidwai]

A friend spoke of Argentine and of Russia. I have been trying to contact Russia. I have contacted the Russian Embassy. Two years ago there was a barter agreement with them. Although it was stated here by a Member on this side that we got wheat from Russia cheaper than from U.S.A., it was not correct. Russia insisted that they would send wheat to us at the open market rate of the U.S.A. and they would take from us, in barter, things at *our* price, not at the world price. At that time we needed wheat very badly and we accepted it. We lost more in that deal than in the other deal with the U.S.A. or other Governments.

But this year I said I am prepared to enter into a long-term agreement with Russia, for supplying us for the next five years 1 million tons of wheat; but the prices will not be the international prices. I said that the prices will be the internal prices of East Punjab. The open market internal price of East Punjab I offered, and in lieu, we said we will supply them whatever they required, without any restriction, at our internal prices. That offer was made first through some friends, then officially, and I think more than a month has passed. We have not heard about it. It seems there is some mention of it in Moscow, because we received a cable from our Ambassador there wanting us to send to him the details of our offer. This is the position.

If Members still think that we are entering into a bad bargain, we are prepared to accept it. But we will be held responsible—if later on we do not find wheat at this price. As a matter of fact, we do not need much import of wheat. It is on account of the shortage of rice that we are importing it. I was in Burma recently and I said: when your prices come down below the wheat prices we will stop importing wheat, we will switch on to rice. But so long as the present international price continues, so long as the U.S.A. Price Support Policy continues, I do not think we will be a gainer if we do not enter into this bargain. Why Britain has done it I do not know, because whatever we agreed to we were constantly in consultation and we differed only in considering whether we should sign it or not. We here decided to sign. They want to pass on the trade also to private merchants and stop paying any subsidy. Now, the average income of a man in England is much higher than ours. They can afford to pay a little higher price but is there any Member in this House who can say that we can also take that risk and force our consumers to pay a higher price. I think the price that we are charging is high. I would try to reduce it this year. We have reduced it by one rupee. Let us hope that, in spite of this price being high, we will be able to reduce it by another rupee next year. But if we do not get this assured price, there is the guarantee price. Supposing next year, the open market price in U.S.A. is lower than this price. Then we will have to pay only the open market price. We will be in a loss only when the open market price is below the minimum price. Then we will be required to pay more. That is not going to happen in the course of two years so long as the food policy continues. There is such a large margin between the present open prices and the minimum prices that I do not think it is going to come in the next four years.

Shri K. K. Basu: May I know the period?

Shri Kidwai: Three years.

श्री भिनारिया : मेरे सवाल का जवाब नहीं मिला ।

श्री किदवई : जवाब उसका बहुत सीधा है कि खरीदने का तरीक़ा क्या है कि हम उन के यहां से एकदम ले लेते हैं या ओपन मारकेट में खरीदते हैं । तो हम अपने आदमी भेजते हैं, वह जा कर वहां गेहूं लेते हैं और वह बेचने वाले अपने बिल भेज देते हैं जिस को वह अपनी गवर्नमेंट से ले लेते हैं । तो यह तो हमारा अख्तियार है कि किस किस्म से खरीदें । तो जो गेहूं अगर ख़राब आया तो उस की दो वजह हो सकती थी । या तो हमारे खरीदने वाले ने सही किस्म पसन्द नहीं की, या यह कि अच्छी किस्म का गेहूं वहां मौजूद नहीं था और हमारे यहां ज़रूरत थी, लिहाज़ा खराब किस्म का ही ले लिया गया ।

श्री चिनारिया : फैक्ट तो यही है कि बहुत खराब गेहूं आया है। ऐसा निकम्मा गेहूं मैं ने पहले कभी नहीं खाया और ऐम० पी० बनने पर ही यह खराब गेहूं मुझे मिला ।

श्री क़िदवई : यहां जितने ऐम० पी० बन कर आये हैं उन्होंने यह गेहूं लिया, लेकिन हम लोगों के सामने अच्छी क़िस्म का गेहूं भी आया है । मगर मैं उम्मीद दिलाता हूं कि अब जो सामान आवेगा वह बहुत अच्छा आवेगा, क्योंकि हम को ज्यादा खरीदना नहीं है ।

The House then adjourned till a Quarter Past Eight of the Clock on Tuesday, the 28th April, 1953.